

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 26, 1911.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

Van Vechten Veeder to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Edwin Porch Morrow to be United States attorney, eastern district of Kentucky.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Eugene L. Lewis to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Benjamin F. Keith to be collector of customs for the district of Wilmington, N. C.

POSTMASTERS.

CONNECTICUT.

James H. Pilling, Waterbury.

GEORGIA.

Wilbur S. Freeman, Claxton.

IDAHO.

William H. Greenhow, Twin Falls.

INDIANA.

Arthur A. Holmes, Sullivan.

John Sharp, Frankton.

Roy E. Turner, Dana.

IOWA.

C. J. Schneider, Garner.

James C. Scott, Glidden.

Henry G. Walker, Iowa City.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Frederick E. Pierce, Greenfield.

NEW JERSEY.

James P. Van Schoick, Manasquan.

NEW YORK.

Thomas Wheeler, Utica.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Edward M. Linville, Kernersville.

TEXAS.

Americus C. Nafus, Mesquite.

VERMONT.

John S. Sweeney, Island Pond.

VIRGINIA.

George D. Kilgore, Norton.

WYOMING.

James V. McClenathan, Sunrise.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, January 26, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer was offered by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INVESTIGATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege of the House. I want to call the Speaker's attention to the fact that the committee appointed to investigate the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Forestry made a report to this House on the 7th of December last, and that said report was supposed to be referred—

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order, that the gentleman is out of order in discussing the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska said that he rose to a question of privilege. The Chair is listening to find out what it is.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Now, Mr. Speaker, that report was supposed to have been referred to a committee of this House. The press of the country so stated, and as a matter of fact the Journal shows that these reports were not referred to any committee until the 19th of December, which was several weeks after they were made to the House and laid on the Speaker's desk, and all efforts of the Members to find the reports were unavailing.

There was a condition of mystery and doubt surrounding them, and finally when the order was entered on the Journal on the 19th day of December it referred the reports to the Committee on Agriculture. They still did not reach that committee for weeks after the reference was made, and only yesterday, after diligent efforts made by a number of the Members of this House, has it been possible to get before that committee those reports which were introduced in the House and laid on the Speaker's desk six or eight weeks ago.

My point is this, that it involves the integrity of the proceedings of this House, and I offer the following resolution, which I ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas on December 7 the House received from the joint committee appointed to investigate the Department of Interior and the Forestry Bureau three reports, made under House joint resolution 103; and Whereas there was unexplained delay, doubt, and mystery, and confusion in referring said reports to the Committee on Agriculture, and the said reference was not made until December 19; and

Whereas the said committee did not receive said reports in accordance with said order of reference until January 25; and

Whereas said reports during that period were neither upon the Speaker's desk nor in the hands of the Committee on Agriculture, to which they were referred, nor of any other committee: Now, therefore, Resolved, That these irregular proceedings and this misleading and improper treatment of these reports, rendering them for six weeks unavailable and inaccessible, constitute a violation of the proper procedure of the House, and the Committee on Rules be, and it is hereby, directed to investigate and report to the House within one week the reasons for the delay and irregular treatment of these reports.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the resolution should go to a committee. I suppose the gentleman asks for immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The resolution proposes to refer the matter to the Committee on Rules for investigation. The Clerk will again read that portion of the resolution.

The Clerk again read the resolution.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of large importance.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my point of order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was deemed of sufficient importance for the two Houses of Congress to appoint and for the President to approve a joint resolution creating a committee to investigate, and that committee was not only instructed to investigate by taking testimony all over the United States, holding open meetings, swear witnesses, and to preserve the testimony and evidence taken in the case, but it was directed to report to this Congress, implying that this Congress, and not some other Congress, at some other time, should act on these reports, and yet from the 7th of December to the present time the Members of this House have not been able to get possession of these reports; have not been able to initiate any proceedings in the House to bring them before this body.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which commands the attention of the House, demands an explanation from those responsible for it. If there is reason why these reports should be hung like Mahomet's coffin, between heaven and earth, being neither upon the Speaker's desk nor in the committee to which they were referred, let that reason be stated. If there is a reason why the House should be prevented from considering and passing upon these reports, let the reason be stated by those responsible for it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I make the suggestion to the gentleman that I have no objection whatever to this committee making the investigation of the allegations which he makes, but he is asking in his resolution that the House adopt the truth of his statement from beginning to end. What is the use of the House adopting the statement and then sending it to a committee to investigate it? If he would say "the alleged delay" in the proper place in his resolution, as far as I am concerned, I would not have the slightest objection to it.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, nobody has denied the statements made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK].

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state at this point that the matter which the gentleman brings now before the House has for the first time come to the attention of the Chair. With the vast number of bills and the vast number of reports that are presented, while the Speaker has general direction of the reference of bills, and is responsible and accepts the responsibility for their reference, it is absolutely impossible for the Speaker, on account of time and largely on account of lack of competency, to give personal attention to the references or to follow those references to their destination. The Chair frankly states to the House, and, if necessary, to the country, this absolute condition touching the public business. The Chair has no recollection about this report. The Chair is informed, however, that promptly the reference was made. However, on reference reports do not go directly to the committee, but go, in fact, directly to the Printing Office to be printed. In this case the

law provides that reports shall be printed and specifies the number. The Chair does not recollect how many are printed, but it is something near 2,000. The Chair apprehends that this is a very voluminous report. The Chair understands, or has an impression, that members of this joint commission desired a greater number than the usual number to be printed, and that could not be done except by concurrent action of the House and the Senate.

The Chair is not aware that the ordinary number have not been printed; but the Chair is under the impression, which can be verified by the records, that the two Houses did by concurrent action order a larger number printed.

The Chair desires to remind the gentleman that because of his absence the House has not had the advantage of his valuable services and suggestions, but, now that he is present and the House will have the advantage of his accustomed vigilance, no doubt the House will be delighted to hear from him and have this matter brought to the attention of the country, as possibly it might have been before if the House had had his valuable services in the business of the country.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Speaker permit me to make a correction?

The SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the criticism which is placed upon me is not deserved.

The SPEAKER. But the Chair is not criticizing the gentleman, but is trying to show that the House has missed the gentleman.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask the privilege of stating some of the facts of which perhaps the Speaker is not aware. Not only have I repeatedly visited the Clerk's office and the various officers of the Clerk for the purpose of ascertaining what had become of these reports which had so mysteriously disappeared, but I have interviewed the gentleman—

The SPEAKER. But the Chair states that he is informed, and believes it to be true, that there is no mystery in the premises.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Speaker permit me to state that inasmuch as he has criticized me—

The SPEAKER. But the Chair has not criticized the gentleman, but is trying to show to the House and, if possible, to the country as well, that the Chair is not subject to the criticism and possibly the House is not subject to the criticism already voiced by the gentleman.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I beg to call the attention of the Speaker to the fact that I have withheld criticism and have asked the committee to investigate and locate the responsibility for this delay, this doubt, and this mystery.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not the only Member of this House who is seeking the whereabouts of these reports. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] has made repeated efforts to ascertain where they were. We have asked the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to whom the reports were referred, and until yesterday he had not even seen these reports. We have visited the office of the Clerk of this House to ascertain and we could not find out where they were, and neither the Clerk of the House nor the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture nor the gentleman who referred these reports under the order of the Speaker could tell where they were. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are not obscure, unimportant matters. They constitute one of the most important matters which are now before this House for its consideration, and I say that it does present a serious question of the privileges of this House to take a proper procedure by which a very important report has been made a matter of mystery and doubt, and it ought to be investigated and an explanation ought to be made to this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask—

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman will allow right there. The Chair has no objection, as one Member of this House or as its Speaker, to any investigation that may be made. Whether these reports, in the ordinary transaction of business, were forwarded to the Government Printing Office and whether they were awaited action for printing of an extra number of copies by concurrent action of the House and Senate the Chair is not advised of his own knowledge. Whether inquiry was made at the Government Printing Office the Chair is not advised. The Chair only desires that a Member of the House should not place the Chair on the one hand and the committee on the other, or the House, under a criticism that may be heralded on its face as an accusation, accepted possibly as a fact, by the ever-vigilant and fair press of the country, until in the ordinary course of proceedings, without prejudice, the facts may be ascertained.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. Speaker, then, to meet the views of the Chair, if the Chair will permit, I will eliminate a part of the resolution reciting the facts, although I think the House

should be acquainted with it, and offer this simple resolution of investigation as a substitute for it, if accepted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska now withdraws his first resolution and offers the following in lieu thereof, which the Clerk will report (H. Res. 931).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and it is hereby, directed to investigate and report to the House within one week all facts connected with the reference of the so-called Ballinger reports and any delay regarding the transmission of said reports to the committee to which referred.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the resolution.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I was not in the Chamber when the gentleman from Nebraska began his remarks, and therefore I am not fully advised as to all he has said in reference to this matter. I wish to say, however, that there does not appear to me to be any mystery about the so-called Ballinger-Pinchot report. It happened I was not present in the House when the gentleman from Massachusetts made his report, and when advised through the press of the city that this report had been brought before the House and had been referred to the Committee on Agriculture, I inquired as to the disposition that had been made of it and was informed that, following the usual procedure, it had been sent to the Government Printing Office. From time to time, as the report failed to appear in the rooms of the Committee on Agriculture, I made inquiry at the Printing Office and was advised that the matter was being delayed on account of the time that it required to prepare and print the lithographic map of Alaska, which was made a part of the report.

Anyone acquainted with the process of lithography and map drawing knows that it is a process which takes time to prepare a map, especially one which presents as great detail as is presented in this map of Alaska, and place it on the stone and have it printed for publication in a report. From all the information I was able to obtain, Mr. Speaker, I was led to the conclusion that no needless delay had occurred in connection with the publication of this report. Certainly, whatever delay there may have been was not due to lack of diligence on the part of the Committee on Agriculture or of its chairman. The committee, through its chairman, insisted diligently that every reasonable expedition should be exercised in the publication of the report and in bringing it before the committee. So it seems to me there is nothing to be investigated, although, so far as I am personally concerned, I have not the slightest objection to such an investigation.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. SCOTT. With pleasure.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the gentleman's explanation really calls for an investigation, because within a few moments we have listened from the lips of the Speaker to an entirely different explanation, which was to the effect that the large number of reports to be printed caused the delay. Now the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT] offers an entirely different explanation.

Mr. MANN. That statement is not fair, and should not go into the Record uncontradicted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state just there, if the gentleman will yield to the Chair, that the Chair did state—and it was probably on a suggestion that came from the clerk at the Speaker's table, without making any investigation himself—that it was desired that a large number should be printed, and that that possibly might explain the delay. The Chair is not bound to literal accuracy in what he stated, because it passes beyond his view after the reference is made, and the Chair now only says that, so far as the Speaker's desk is concerned and the action of the Speaker's force, the Chair believes that it was strictly in accordance with the law and the rules of the House. And the Chair further, so far as the desk is concerned, without his having examined the Journals, is responsible for the proper reference, although in point of fact the Chair does not make these references, except through another.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Now, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT] was on his feet. The Chair only desires to say to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] that if he is as anxious to have the very facts known as the Chair is anxious, without regard to sensational statement, the Chair will be entirely satisfied.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, repeating what I said a moment ago, that I had no objection whatever to the adoption of this resolution, I desire, with all possible emphasis, to state to the House that there has been no laches, no neglect or negligence

on the part of the Committee on Agriculture, or its chairman, in relation to the publication and the appearance of this report. No suggestion has come to the chairman of that committee from any source that there should be a delay. No suggestion or hint has come from any source that it was not to be desired that a report should be made upon this report. Therefore the adoption of the resolution can only bring to light, in my judgment, facts that are already well known, and can not in any degree inform the House concerning facts which it does not know.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Kansas, I think he is not quite familiar with the facts in this case. Now, I am not undertaking by what I say to cast any aspersion upon the Speaker nor anyone connected with the Speaker. All the resolution seeks to do is to find out the facts.

Now, here is the RECORD in front of me, which shows that on December 7 Mr. McCALL made these reports. They were not referred then, Mr. Speaker. The RECORD shows that those reports were not referred until the 19th day of December to the Committee on Agriculture. Now, this House, as representatives of the American people, have a right to know why this report remained somewhere, somehow, for some reason, without being referred to any committee for 12 days. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It looks to me like, instead of the gentleman from Kansas saying that there is no reason for an investigation, that he would be quite willing to have the investigation. Nobody has undertaken to say that any particular person was responsible for this. What we want, and by this resolution seek, is to locate the responsibility. I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that this report, when it was made to the House on the 7th day of December, in some way—I do not know how—fell into the hands of the clerk in the department of executive documents, and there it remained for 12 days.

Now, the Speaker will not say, nor will anyone speaking for him say, that it takes 12 days to refer a report made to Congress to the proper committee. Under the usual procedure in this House reports are referred on the day they are made and not delayed 12 days. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It has taken, sir, 49 days from the time this report came to this House to get to the Committee on Agriculture; and this is the short session. If it takes a like number of days for the report to get back, without even time for consideration by the committee, Congress will have adjourned, and a question which was deemed of such great importance that a commission of this House and the Senate sat for six long months investigating the question, expending the public money, amounting to thousands of dollars, without any opportunity being given to the House to investigate and pass upon it. Mr. Ballinger himself wrote a letter to Congress containing the fullest, freest, and most complete investigation.

You authorized this commission to go forward and do that thing. The commission, so far as the House side is concerned, stands equally divided, three to three upon this report. It is a duty that this House not only owes Secretary Ballinger, whose official reputation is at issue, but a duty this House owes to the people of the country—whose property amounting to millions, aye, billions, of dollars is said to be in unsafe hands—to pass upon these reports and say which should be adopted as the judgment of this House. The delay about this report getting to the Agricultural Committee should be investigated. It is a question that ought to be investigated. I went myself to the secretary of the Committee on Agriculture and made an inquiry about it. He told me that four days ago, notwithstanding this report had been somewhere for 45 days, he called up the Printing Office and they said to him they had not even started to print it. These things ought to be looked into. No one wants to cast any aspersion upon the Speaker or upon anybody else; but let us know the facts, and whatever the facts are let the country know them. That is all I want. I believe this body and the country ought to have them. I think the resolution ought to be adopted. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt but that when investigation is made it will be ascertained that this report was referred when it was presented.

Mr. JAMES. I will say to the gentleman, here is the RECORD. You make that statement; read the RECORD and see if the statement I have made is correct.

Mr. MANN. I will make this statement, that I have no doubt when the matter is investigated it will be found the report when presented was referred, and I do not make that statement without some knowledge of the subject.

Mr. JAMES. Then you ought to correct the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. I hold in my hand one volume of this report. There are 13 volumes. Here [exhibiting] is one of the maps

which had to be made. I presume when we get a new Printing Office, and the gentlemen on that side get control, they will make maps offhand. We never have found any way of making maps offhand yet.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman allow me—

Mr. MANN. Pardon me until I make my statement. The gentleman has just made his speech.

Mr. JAMES. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. It requires time to make a map of this sort and print it. It requires time to print 13 volumes at the best. Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JAMES. Well, in answer to the statement about printing the maps, I will say that as the commission proceeded these records were all printed. There were distributed from day to day to each member two copies of the proceedings of the day prior. In addition, each volume of this testimony, one of which the gentleman has in his hand, was printed and furnished the members of the commission. No doubt every member of that commission has a complete and absolute record of that commission's proceedings now in his hands; and, in addition to that, over in the office of investigation, in Senator Nelson's office, you will find all these records now. So it was not necessary to order this printing nor for them to be reprinted, because the committee had had them once printed and Members could be furnished with a copy without all that trouble.

Mr. MANN. It is perfectly self-evident to anyone familiar with the matter that it was necessary to reprint these when presented to the House. How much time it took I do not pretend to know.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I just came in while this discussion was in progress. I think I can make an explanation in reference to it. A resolution passed the House recently for printing this Ballinger report and evidence. There has been some complaint about the report not being ready. One of the members of the committee came to me as chairman of the Printing Committee, and I immediately started an investigation to discover what was the cause of the delay. I was informed by the Public Printer that the delay was caused by the preparation of a plate of a map of Alaska which it was desired to insert in the minority report. That plate was being prepared by the Geological Survey. At my urgent request they hurried it up. They said they thought they would be able to furnish the plate by Wednesday.

Mr. MANN. That is the map to which I called the attention of the House and which the gentleman from Kentucky said they had in their possession at the time the report was made.

Mr. JAMES. I said that all the records in the case were in the possession of the committee.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman said that this map which I showed to the House was in possession of the committee.

Mr. JAMES. Oh, so far as your map is concerned, that is a mere pretense.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. The plate for the map of Alaska had to be made by the Geological Survey. They said it could be finished by Wednesday, but I requested the Public Printer to hasten the work and try and get it earlier, if possible. He called upon me Saturday night and said the Geological Survey had promised it on Monday.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. I will yield.

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman is chairman of the Committee on Printing. I have just been informed that the Printing Office has stated that they are now commencing on the second volume of the testimony.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. The Public Printer said that they had several volumes ready.

Mr. JAMES. Several volumes of the two volumes?

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. No; I think he said several of the 13 volumes. About half of the volumes, I believe, was the information given me.

Mr. JAMES. I am informed by reliable authority that the Printing Office has stated that they have only two volumes ready. Now, if it takes 49 days to print two volumes, how long after Congress adjourns will it take to get the remaining volumes ready? [Laughter.]

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Kentucky can figure that out on his own hypothesis. I know nothing about it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, both of these statements are reconcilable; they do not have to print the second volume before they print the later volumes.

Mr. JAMES. Oh, that would be going backward, as you always do on every question. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Well, that is as fine an argument as I ever heard the gentleman from Kentucky make.

Mr. JAMES. I think it is absolutely good on the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. That is the limit of the gentleman's logic.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. I want to say for the information of the House that my attention was first called to this by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MADISON], a member of the committee. He and I went to investigate it and did what we could to reach a prompt delivery of the reports and the evidence.

Considerable stress was laid on the fact that the report was wanted first. After some effort I discovered the delay was caused because it was desired to put in the minority report a map of Alaska, the plate for which had not been prepared, but by urgent request the Public Printer hurried it up and said it would be ready on Monday. I do not think any particular blame should attach to anybody.

Mr. JAMES. According to the argument just made by the gentleman from Illinois, which, I suppose, the gentleman from Pennsylvania approves, the fact that they did not have the map to go into the second volume would not hinder them from going forward and printing the fourth, fifth, and sixth, and so on, would it?

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MADISON] was very anxious that the report should be printed first.

Mr. JAMES. The gentleman knows as a matter of fact that both the minority and the majority report and the report of Mr. MADISON have been printed for weeks.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. The printing ordered by the resolution of Congress was delayed by the making of the plate for the map of Alaska.

Mr. JAMES. The map does not go with the report.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is a matter for the committee to determine.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Nebraska that unless he moves the previous question I shall do it. I do not think there will be anything left of this case if it keeps on. I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 31856) making appropriations for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask, first, how much time remaining unconsumed there is.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has 11 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Mississippi 1 hour and 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will ask that the gentleman from Mississippi consume some of his time.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I note in this bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia several appropriations for the care and betterment of the morals of the youth of this great District, in which is situate the Capitol of the Nation and where all the Federal laws are made, as well as the laws governing the District of Columbia. The press of the city periodically calls attention to the violation of the laws relating to the sale of intoxicating liquors in this District, and particularly the sale thereof to minors.

While large appropriations are made for the administration and enforcement of laws in the District and for the care and protection and government of those who have gone astray, might it not be well to help matters by strengthening the law relating to the sale of intoxicating liquors to minors, to the end that the enforcement of such law would be less difficult and violations less frequent?

The thought pressed upon the American public and advocated by those engaged in the sale of intoxicating liquors, as well as others, is that regulation is better than prohibition.

The law in the District of Columbia relating to the sale of intoxicating liquors to minors is as follows:

That hereafter it shall be unlawful for the licensee, owner, proprietor, or any employee of a license, owner, or proprietor of any barroom, or any other establishment in the District of Columbia in which intoxicating liquors of any kind are sold, to sell, give, or dispense in any manner intoxicating liquors of any kind to any person under the age of 21 years.

Any person knowingly violating the provisions of this paragraph shall be amenable to a fine of \$25, or imprisonment for 30 days, or both, in the discretion of the court, and in addition to such penalty the license for the place in which such intoxicating liquors were sold to a minor shall be revoked.

Last session I introduced in this House a bill to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1893, as amended by subsequent acts, and to amend the same in paragraph 38 of section 7, at the end of said paragraph 38, by striking out the word "knowingly," between the word "person" and the word "violating," in said paragraph, so that part of said paragraph 38 as so amended should read as above set forth with the word "knowingly" stricken out.

This bill is still pending before the House Committee on the District of Columbia. In my judgment the bill ought to be favorably reported by the committee, passed by the House, and ought to become a law. It is a reasonable amendment and ought to meet the approval of those who favor proper regulation.

In the State of Missouri, which I in part represent, the dominant thought is regulation as against prohibition, as evidenced by the last expression of the people of that State. We have what is called a high-license law, providing for strict regulation, and the proposed amendment, striking out the word "knowingly," would make the law of the District regarding the sale of intoxicating liquors to minors similar to the law of Missouri and other States in regard thereto.

Most of the States, if not all, moved by the same consideration of public interest and benefit, have enacted statutes prohibiting sales of intoxicating liquors to minors. The important question is whether the law should be so framed as to require the Government to assume the burden of proving knowledge on the part of the seller, or that burden should be shifted to the defendant as in some States, or whether the entire risk should be upon the defendant as in other States—whether loose regulation or strict regulation should be written in the law.

In my judgment the law ought to be strong enough to permit enforcement against those who lightly regard the law. Those who try to keep the law need not fear strict laws. Where the burden is upon the Government to show knowledge a conviction can scarcely ever be had unless the law is openly and notoriously violated. The burden ought at least be shifted on the question of knowledge, if not the entire risk be taken by the defendant. If convictions are to be had for sale to minors the Government ought not to be required to show knowledge on the part of the defendant. The law regarding sales to minors in the Capital City of the Nation ought to be as strict as in the States, and should be enforced—and those upon whom devolves the enforcement of the laws ought to be helped by the lawmakers to the end that the law should be strong enough to make its enforcement easier and the violation more difficult or the escape from punishment less easy. The law ought not to be made weak to aid those who carelessly regard the law or its enforcement. The trade of minors may be valuable to some sellers, and some engaged in the sale may prefer loose laws under which convictions can not easily be had or are practically impossible. The public welfare, the morals of the youth of every community, the well-being and proper growth of those nearing maturity is of the utmost importance, and far more important than the tender care of some seller who lightly regards the law and is careless about its requirements and against its enforcement.

In prosecutions for illegal sales of liquor to minors the defense most usually set up is ignorance or mistake of fact as to the age of the purchaser. In cases where the statute makes knowledge on the part of the defendant an element of the offense, with the burden on the State or Government of showing such knowledge, the defendant easily goes acquitted without being compelled to offer any evidence on his part. In such cases convictions are difficult and rare. Where the statute does not especially make the knowledge of the purchaser's minority an essential element of the offense of selling to him, the question fairly arises whether honest ignorance or mistake of fact is a good defense to an indictment for such offense. The burden at least would be shifted and be on the defense, and ignorance or mistake of fact would be an affirmative defense, and he must then show that he exercised special caution and diligence to discover whether or not the purchaser was a minor. He must

assume the burden of showing that he acted in an honest and reasonable though mistaken belief that the purchaser was of age and had a right to buy. Such seems to be the main rule, but not universally accepted to be correct.

In many of the States it is held that the vendor of intoxicating liquors is bound to determine for himself, at his peril, whether or not the purchaser is a minor. In such States ignorance of fact is no defense, the purpose of the statute for the protection of the public and the youth of the country being to require a degree of diligence on the part of the seller as to render violations rare or infrequent. The law imposes upon the licensed seller the duty of seeing that the party to whom he sells is authorized to buy, and if he makes this sale without this knowledge he does it at his peril. He undertakes this risk in engaging in the business.

As the law now stands in this District the burden is on the Government to show knowledge. If the word "knowingly" be stricken out, the burden would be shifted to the defendant to show want of knowledge and the facts and circumstances under which he sold; or he would sell at his own risk, and want of knowledge would be no defense, simply a matter of mitigation.

The discretion rests at all times with those who administer the laws of the Government as to whether, under all the facts and circumstances, a prosecution ought to be had. But with the change in the law there would be fewer sales to minors, more careful conduct on the part of the liquor seller, less complaint on the part of the public, less occasion for attack by the press, and a better condition in the community. The minor would quickly be made aware of the change in the law. What the liquor sellers ought to want is strict regulation, a cessation of sales to minors, and other loose conduct of saloons, to the end that prohibition be not hastened, if regulation be right. Violations of the law arouse public sentiment against those who sell and against the sale of intoxicating liquors, and loose laws and loose enforcement of the law and careless disregard of the law by those who violate the law for gain invite prohibition, which may come to the District of Columbia as well as elsewhere unless strict regulation by law and its enforcement become a fact in the District.

This proposed change in the law is a simple and reasonable change, and ought to be made, and, in my judgment, would be in the interest of better regulation.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD].

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the fortification of the Panama Canal. I have received a large number of letters on that proposition. Here is a letter, representing 100,000 Quakers, which is in harmony with the moral and progressive spirit of the day. This letter speaks for 100,000 Quakers; and, as I have said before upon the floor of this House, I believe if there is any one thing that this country needs more than another it is more Quakers and fewer battleships. This letter is as follows:

MOUNT KISCO, N. Y., January 23, 1911.

DEAR SIR: As chairman of the executive committee on legislation of the Five Years Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, which comprises 11 American yearly meetings and represents a membership of nearly 100,000, I write to protest against the proposed expenditure of the public funds for the fortification of the Panama Canal, and request that you vote and use your influence against such use of the public funds, and I respectfully urge upon you the advantages of procuring by international agreement the neutralization of the whole Canal Zone.

Very truly, yours,

JAMES WOOD,

Chairman Executive Committee on Legislation.

To Hon. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD.

In place of the motto, "In time of peace prepare for war," I believe it is a gentler and more humane and patriotic sentiment to say that in time of peace we should prepare to make that peace permanent and perpetual. [Applause.]

I am opposed to fortifying the Panama Canal, because there is absolutely no necessity for it. There can be no excuse for wasting twenty millions more of our hard-earned tax money to further exploit militarism. So far in this debate I have failed to find one valid reason for it, either in the recommendations of the President or the indorsement of the President's recommendations by the great Scotch steel king, Carnegie, or in any argument made by the deluded devotees of militarism on this floor.

It seems to me that this stupendous project, the greatest of either ancient or modern times on sea or land, should be made a great free waterway, unvexed by hostile cannon or an idle army of useless soldiers. I propose to discuss this question of fortification from the commercial and ethical standpoints, regardless of all existing treaties. I am convinced, however, that our treaty obligations, both moral and legal, bind us not to fortify. As a free Republic, aiming to lead the Christian

civilization of the world, we should neutralize this great waterway and thereby proclaim to all the world that, as the most potent force in advancing the cause of amity among the leading powers of the Old World, we dedicate this canal to peace, commerce, progress, and prosperity.

The whole ethical movement of the age is against big battleships and big navies and big standing armies, and this country is strong enough and should be courageous enough to lead this movement.

Is peace asking for the fortification of the Panama Canal? Is public good clamoring for it? Is patriotism stretching out a warning hand to check the present trend toward safer and saner living? On the contrary, are we not pledged by glorious precedent, as in the splendid record of the Suez Canal, through solemn treaty with foreign powers, through the expanding peace principles, moving church, school, and college, municipalities, and State and Federal powers, to the benign policy of social and economical cooperation, swayed by reason and unawed by force?

Only the makers and molders of guns and cannon, the fomentors of war and discontent, the fabricators of alarming statistics, and the men who thrive on war and its gilded decadence want the rich revenues that should make for lasting peace diverted into the menace and mockery of war. Before Congress goes into the hazardous business of fortifying the Panama Canal the appeal should be made to the American people, in order that we may ascertain whether it is wanted and the reason why it should be done. We have no battleships or forts on our northern frontier, extending for more than 3,000 miles, and yet it is proposed to spend some twenty millions of dollars to fortify the Panama Canal on an acquired zone only 10 miles wide.

My distinguished colleague [Mr. KEIFER], who has made a profound and exhaustive argument against the fortification of the canal, estimates that the fortifications, with the great guns that will be demanded and the battalions of armed soldiers required to man the guns, will run the figures to \$100,000,000.

We have no fortifications from the entrance of the St. Lawrence River around our great chain of lakes between the United States and Canada for 2,500 miles. Even old Fort Mackinac—guarding the straits of the three Great Lakes, Superior, Michigan, and Ontario—was dismantled by Grover Cleveland when President and now constitutes a pleasure park for the State of Michigan. Has such a surplus of revenues from the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill been acquired as to warrant an expenditure of twenty millions or more for fortifications on a fatal, fever-cursed canal in a torrid zone 1,000 miles from our southern border line, merely to further exploit and amplify the present dangerous and demoralizing military propaganda, merely to convince the empires across the Atlantic that we have parted with the simple republic of the fathers and are now on the toboggan slide to a military oligarchy?

The cost of the Panama Canal to date has been \$375,201,000, covering a period of seven years. Forty-five thousand men, skilled and unskilled labor, are at work on that canal, chiefly at the Culebra Cut and the Gatun Dam. The latter, when completed, will back up the waters of the Chagres River and inundate 165 square miles. To do this, whole towns which will be razed and submerged have been bought by the United States Government.

The Culebra Cut, through the Continental Divide, is 9 miles in length; its greatest depth is to be 520 feet, of which amount 400 feet has been excavated, leaving a layer of 120 feet to be removed. If it has taken \$375,000,000 and more to carry out the work of cutting down and damming up thus far, and the work is but three-quarters done, it will not be a far-reaching mathematical problem to ascertain the cost of the remaining one-fourth. At least \$100,000,000 more will be required, irrespective of the proposed expenditure of millions more on fortifications. Surely no one is so verdant as to suppose that the twenty or more millions asked for the fortification of the Panama Canal by President Taft is anything but the entering wedge of extending fortifications of the Panama Zone and the illimitable frontier, Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean, extending around the United States. Nothing grows by what it feeds upon so rapidly as the cruel and uncontrollable war spirit.

When imperialism in the United States laid violent hands upon the Philippines there were few who could have foreseen the vast Naval and Army expenditure involved—an expenditure exceeding eighty millions a year; a deadening drain on the resources of the people of the States, with no reciprocal benefits, aggregating to date almost \$1,000,000,000.

The Porter-Drago agreement has relieved us of a naval force in South America. Our entire possessions, the Philippines excepted, are free from danger and they are ocean-wide removed from the Panama Zone. One by one the South American Re-

publics have entered The Hague Conference in the past few years, each Republic being entitled to four representatives—the Argentine Republic, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Santo Domingo, Uruguay, Venezuela—all bound to keep the peace, to protect and defend the Panama Canal.

Returning to the dictum of Mr. Carnegie recalls an editorial in the *Advocate of Peace*, on the riot of the war spirit. I quote:

With President Eliot, of Harvard, in cold blood advising the Jewish young men to join the militia, become fighters, and revive the ancient martial spirit of the Hebrews, and a Michigan University professor proposing the introduction of dueling as a regular part of American college education, it looks as if the god of brutality had a good many unsuspected strongholds which it will be necessary for the friends of peace to storm before universal peace wins its final victory.

We are spending now fully 72 per cent of our Government income on wars and preparation for war. Lloyd-George, chancellor of the exchequer and leader of British statesmanship, in carefully prepared statistics, estimates that the amount expended annually by the nations to maintain vast armaments amounts to \$2,250,000,000—two billions and a quarter drawn from productive industry and directed to the channels of destruction in the insane rivalry for great armies and navies. Were the 72 per cent spent by the United States for war purposes cut down to one-half that sum and the other half devoted to the advancement of commerce and industry, our country might show less of pomp and pageantry and vulgar display, but would be a first-class power in the true sense of national greatness, based on the thrift and prosperity of the people. The best estimate of the greatness of a nation is not in the size of its cities or the tons of steel in its continental stretch of railroads, but in the kind of men and women the country turns out; in the best average of its citizenship in comfort, thrift and content, and equality of opportunity.

If one-half the money we are worse than wasting in preparation for improbable wars was spent for the improvement of our rivers and harbors and great waterways, or for the advancement of science and public health, or scientific investigation into the causes and suppression of poverty and its relation to crime, or the rights and relations of employer and employed, or the care and protection of child-rearing women and the exemption of the children from labor, or pensions for the aged and soldier dependents of the Republic, we would be entitled to be classed as a great Christian nation.

President Taft owes it to the people of the United States, the true Christian people, to take his stand against the pressing force of his war dragon which is now manifesting such a rabid spirit even in the Capitol. For the past two months, as the debates on this floor will establish, the war talk has occupied at least one-third of the time, while measures of vital moment to the people have been compelled to wait.

Washington, in his farewell address, after eight years of bitter struggle to plant the young Republic on sure foundations, urged his countrymen to avoid the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasion of expense but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden we ourselves ought to bear.

The late Justice David J. Brewer, of the United States Supreme Court, who viewed the subject of international peace and arbitration, as he did all subjects, from the ethical side, in a plea for "The mission of the United States in the cause of peace," said:

First a thought, a wish; then a faith; next a struggle; at last a fact. So have entered into human life and history some of its profoundest truths. Such has been and is to be the story of universal peace.

Further, Justice Brewer, reviewing the history of bloodshed and desolation marking the evolution of governments, contends for a peace secured by choice and established on justice. The strong may not combine to command the weak; the equalities of nations must be recognized in all disputes. "It may be laid down as a political and historical truth," he asserts, "that a peace which is born only of force is a peace which is temporary and disappointing."

Appropriations for the year ending June 30, 1910, for the Army, fortifications, and the Military Academy amount to \$111,897,515.67; for the Navy, \$126,935,199.05; for pensions, including the ever-increasing Philippine roll, \$160,908,000; a total on account of war and preparations for imaginary wars of \$409,740,714.72; while the total executive, legislative, and judicial appropriations for the same length of time were \$32,007,049. In other words, the appropriations for the Army and Navy, the gewgaw and fortifications, was twelve times more than the entire cost of the civil departments of Government service. For one year our cost of the Army and Navy

was thirty-seven times more than for the entire eight years of Washington's administration.

When President Taft asks for a congressional appropriation to fortify the Panama Canal, he does not take into account the will and attitude of the American people. By what right or authority does the President assume to speak for the American people on this enormously extravagant and useless project at least four years before there is any necessity for official action and before the people have had any opportunity to be heard?

Mr. Carnegie, in his plea for a fortified Panama Canal, says that those forts will probably never be called upon to fire a hostile shot. In such case it would fall under the head of "useless expense," against which we are warned by Washington. But we know very well that the fortifications and guns provided for this year will multiply yearly in conformance with the growth and development of the war craze, now a pronounced and recognized disease in the United States. The venerable Senator Frye, of Maine, in a protest against the present foolhardy craze for a gigantic war equipment, is reported to have said, "I have begun to despair of the Republic." May it not be possible that displays of feudalism like this Chief Executive demands to fortify a great waterway of commerce may have led the Senator to question whether Congress is still the law-making power of the United States, or whether we have not been, more and more, letting out the job to the man at the head, erroneously named the Chief Executive? It looks like it when the king of the steel and iron trust of the world, masking in the garments of the Prince of Peace, issues an imperial decree, urging Congress to hold up the hands of a Chief Executive who would do much evil that no good may ever come, except to the all-pervading and all-dominating combines who forge from steel the implements of wholesale bloody murder.

The time to end the barbarism of war is to scotch the reptile in the head when we have a chance. Here and now in our country let us strike the deathblow by setting ourselves against the fortification of the Panama Canal. We must not forget that for generations the habits of fight are in our blood. Not a thousand years ago our ancestors were raiding the Christian monasteries of England, continuing their deadly marches with the bodies of newborn infants carried on their spears and the entrails of the mothers strung around their necks as trophies. Rabbi Charles Fleischer made reply to President Eliot, who urged the young Jews to join the militia. I quote from the great rabbi, who makes President Eliot look diminutive in moral stature:

The Harvard sage errs in saying that there is no reason why the Jews should not make good fighters. There happens to be the best of reason. The Jew has got out of the habit of fighting. He has lost the primitive man's desire to kill, because he has been so long civilized. You can't brutalize him again. I am happy to feel that, in the main, Eliot's appeal to the Jews must be in vain, because, by long tradition, culminating in native instinct, your average Jew believes that Israel's mission is peace.

Our great educator, Horace Mann, was right when he said:

If a thousandth part of what has been spent in war and in preparing its mighty engines had been devoted to the development of reason and the diffusion of Christian principles, nothing would have been known for centuries of its terrors, its suffering, its impoverishment, and its demoralization, but what we learned from history.

It would be an invaluable message to the Old World and an all-powerful tribute and evangel to the peace of the world should the United States make the Panama Canal open to the trade and commerce of the world and free from bastioned walls and frowning cannon.

The scholars and jurists and patriots of Boston, in the same spirit that made Boston the leading patriotic center of the colonists of America 136 years ago, recently met and discussed the President's project to fortify the Panama Canal. The leading speaker was the Hon. Richard Olney, the foremost jurist and diplomat of New England.

I submit a summary of the result of that meeting, and trust every Member on this floor will ponder it well.

The first reason given for not fortifying the canal is that, according to an agreement signed by The Hague Conference in 1907, unfortified coasts can not be bombarded.

Because the original intention of our Government, as distinctly expressed in 1908 and previously, was to prohibit fortifications on the canal.

Because, though the Suez Canal was built with English money, England agreed to its neutralization. The Straits of Magellan are also neutralized, and the Interparliamentary Union in 1910 declared in favor of the neutralization of all inter-oceanic waterways.

Because the United States, in all its history, has never been attacked, and began every foreign war it ever had, and is too important a customer for any great nation at this late day to wantonly attack.

Because, with the experience of nearly a century's peace with England, insured by our undefended Canadian border line, until we have asked for complete arbitration treaties with all possible future enemies and have been refused, we should be insincere in increasing our war measures.

And lastly, let me add, because it is a wanton and wicked waste of millions of tax money of the American people.

There are no ideas that appeal to any patriotic American citizen in the project to fortify the Panama Canal. The project appeals only to force, to fear, to suspicion. There is no morality, no ethics, in steel cannon and shotted guns. A project without ideas reminds me of a sentiment of President Garfield, given at a reunion of the Army of the Cumberland 10 years after the war:

Ideas are the great warriors of the world, and a war that has no ideas behind it is simply a brutality.

The project to fortify the Panama Canal is a brutality and a disgrace to our much-boasted Christian civilization.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, we all realize that there is a sentiment, growing stronger and stronger every day, throughout the country in favor of doing something to rehabilitate our merchant marine. This is patriotic, eminently proper, and should be encouraged by every true American. It is unfortunate, however, that many well-meaning citizens, who desire to see our ocean trade carried in our own merchant marine, have little knowledge of the best way to do it, or of the causes which gradually drove our shipping from the high seas and placed us finally at the bottom of the list of the world's maritime powers.

There is no man in this country more anxious and more willing to enact proper legislation to restore the American merchant marine than myself, but I want to do it honestly; I want to do it along constitutional lines; and I want to do it in harmony with that fundamental principle of equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

It is a fact—a most deplorable fact—and every man who has investigated the subject knows it, that we have less registered tonnage for deep-sea carrying trade to-day than we had 100 years ago. In 1810 the United States, with a population of less than 10,000,000 inhabitants, owned more registered tonnage for ocean carrying trade than the United States in 1910, with a population of over 90,000,000. The American deep-sea tonnage in 1810 was over 1,200,000, and it is now less than 800,000, and, what is worse still, it showed an actual decrease of more than 6,000 tons last year. In 1810 American ships, flying the American flag and manned by American sailors, carried over 90 per cent of our deep-sea trade and a great part of that of all the countries of Europe. To-day we carry very little of our own trade and practically none of other countries, notwithstanding the fact that we should be the foremost maritime power in the world.

It is a sad commentary on our commercial growth and material greatness that more than nine-tenths of our once great and powerful deep-sea fleet has vanished, and not one new keel for an ocean-going merchant ship is being laid to-day on either our Atlantic or Pacific coast, while the vessels of foreign nations through our ports and monopolize more than nine-tenths of all our import and export commerce.

In 1810 over 92 per cent of our export and import trade was carried in American bottoms; in 1910 less than 8 per cent of our imports and exports were carried in American ships. The United States pays to the owners of foreign deep-sea vessels for conveying our freight and passengers over \$300,000,000 a year, and much of this vast sum of money goes to the owners of foreign steamers which are regularly enrolled on the merchant cruiser lists of European governments, manned by naval-reserve officers and sailors, and available for immediate service against us in case of war. The British Empire has 16,800,000 tons of merchant shipping; Germany has 8,960,000 tons; France, 3,680,000; Norway, 1,960,000; and Italy, 1,580,000. The larger part of all these great deep-sea fleets is engaged in the ocean carrying trade, but the Government of the United States, which produces and exports more merchandise than any other nation on earth, has a fleet registry of deep-sea vessels of less than 800,000 tons. These comparisons challenge our intelligence and constitute an indictment against our boasted patriotism.

The question of the hour is, How shall we restore the American merchant marine? What shall we do to place our flag again on every sea? What remedy shall we adopt to regain our ocean carrying trade and revive our shipbuilding industry? There are several policies proposed by those who desire to restore the American flag to the high seas and secure for our country its proper share of the world's ocean commerce; and, briefly enumerated, they are as follows:

First. Ship subsidies.

Second. Discriminating taxes.

Third. Free ships.

Mr. Chairman, let me briefly discuss these proposed remedies in their order, stating as succinctly as I can, without prejudice, the merits and the demerits of each proposition; and I shall do so from a patriotic and not from a political point of view, because, in my judgment, the restoration of our merchant marine is purely an economic question based on patriotism and rises superior to political policies and partisan considerations.

Let us come, then, to the first proposition, to wit, ship subsidies. In the light of the past, I think we can safely say that the American people are unalterably opposed to a ship-subsidy raid on the Treasury. A subsidy is a bounty, a bonus, a gratuity, and it never has succeeded, and it never will succeed, in accomplishing the purpose desired. All history proves it conclusively. Wherever and whenever it has been tried it has failed. In my opinion, if a subsidy bill should pass it would not restore our American merchant marine or aid our shipbuilding industries. It is a waste of time to talk about ship subsidies, and I believe every honest American is opposed to the policy. We might just as well pass a bill to pay a subsidy to every man who grows a bushel of wheat or raises a bale of cotton as to pay a subsidy to the man who builds a ship.

I am now, always have been, and always expect to be opposed to ship subsidies that rob the many for the benefit of the few. Ship subsidies do not build ships; they create ocean monopolies. Ship subsidies will not give workmen employment in American shipyards; the money taken without justification from the Treasury of the people will simply go into the capacious pockets of the men who own the ships now in commission. Every scheme of this kind simply permits respectable corruption and benefits the few at the expense of the many. The principle of ship subsidies is inherently wrong, absolutely indefensible, and no man who understands the question can justify the plan in the face of the facts.

The taxpayers of our country, burdened now almost beyond endurance, are opposed to ship subsidies. They are opposed to any gift bill. They say no private business should be aided by direct grants from the Treasury. Ship subsidies are subversive of the eternal principles of equality, contrary to the theory of our institutions, of doubtful expediency, and at war with the spirit of the Constitution. Congress has no power to subsidize any trade, on land or sea, at the expense of the taxpayers of our country. Any attempt to fasten this odious system of ship subsidies on the legislative policy of the country is undemocratic, un-republican, and un-American.

For years, in Congress and out of Congress, I have been advocating honest and intelligent legislation to restore our merchant marine, and for years the men in control of Congress have turned to my appeals a deaf ear. The party in power is responsible for the present deplorable condition of our merchant marine, and every intelligent student of the subject is aware of the fact. So much for ship subsidies, which never did and never will build a ship or do any good for those in commission unless the subsidies are large and continuing. Stop the subsidy and the remedy fails. The men who cry loudest for subsidies are the men who will get the subsidies or the unpatriotic champions systematically working in the interest of foreign shipowners.

Now, let us take up the second proposition, namely, discriminating duties and tonnage taxes in favor of American-built ships and against ships flying the flag of a foreign country. This was the policy so successfully in operation in this country up to 1828, when, to please foreign interests, the law was suspended, and from that day to this our prestige on the high seas has been declining until it is less to-day than it was a century ago.

Many true friends of our merchant marine believe that if this policy of the fathers was restored it would revive our overseas carrying trade and in a very few years build up our ship industries so that we would again secure our share of the ocean commerce of the world and save millions and millions of dollars that we pay annually to foreign shipowners. In reading the report of the Merchant Marine Commission, I observe that several of the largest shipbuilders testified that they formerly believed in subsidies, but had changed their opinions and now preferred discriminating duties.

There seems to be but one objection, so far as I can learn, to a return to tonnage taxes and discriminating duties, and this objection comes from the selfish advocates of ship subsidies, who declare that we have commercial treaties with foreign Governments containing the favored-nation clause, and in order to inaugurate the policy of discriminating duties it will be necessary to change our commercial treaties, and this can not be done without giving these favored nations one year's notice.

This objection, however, is more apparent than real, for there is no doubt the change could be made if this Government wanted to make it, and a year's notice to bring it about would cause no great delay, especially when we consider that nothing has been done for our deep-sea shipping in more than a quarter of a century.

If we desire to change our commercial treaties with these favored nations, we have a perfect right to do so and no nation can object. If there be retaliation, two can play at the same game, and our trade is more important to other nations than their trade is to our country. As I have said, many patriotic citizens and several distinguished Members of Congress who have given this subject much thought and consideration believe that reasonable discriminating duties and tonnage taxes will effectually solve the problem in the most feasible and practicable way. President McKinley favored a return to this policy, and in his letter of acceptance said:

We must encourage our merchant marine; we must have more ships; they must be manned by and owned by Americans. The policy of discriminating duties in favor of our shipping which prevailed in the early days of our history should be again promptly adopted by Congress and vigorously supported until our prestige and supremacy on the seas are fully attained.

Mr. Chairman, it is my candid opinion, and I have no hesitancy in saying so, that if we had continued the policy of the fathers and not suspended our early navigation laws we would to-day be the greatest maritime nation in the world and our flag would be on every sea and our ships would be carrying the ocean commerce not only of our own country, but perhaps half of that of all the other great nations of the world.

And now, sir, let us discuss the third remedy, to wit, free ships, by which I mean the right of an American citizen to build or buy a ship anywhere, give it the benefit of the American registry laws, and place upon it the American flag. This is the good, old, honest American plan. To bring it about, all that is necessary to do is to repeal the prohibitive law, which is a blot on our common sense and a disgrace to our maritime intelligence; but this will never be done while the beneficiaries of protection can prevent it, because they believe it will be a deathblow to the theory of their sacred doctrine. This policy of free ships has been advocated for years by many able and patriotic men who thoroughly understand this shipping question and deplore the loss we are sustaining every year by reason of the elimination of our merchant marine.

It is my judgment, and it is their opinion, that we can grant subsidies as much as we please, but we will never put our shipping on a par with other countries until we do what every other maritime country on the face of the earth has done, and that is to put ships on the free list.

What a spectacle is presented when we realize that by virtue of our existing navigation laws the American who builds or buys a ship in a foreign country is an outlaw—prevented from giving the vessel American registration and compelled to sail the ship under the protection of a foreign flag! A ship is the only thing under our protective-tariff laws a citizen of the United States is prohibited from importing into this country.

There are, of course, several flimsy objections urged to free ships by the subsidy boomers, most of which are absolutely untenable, but I shall not go into details now and discuss them, because I believe it will be impossible to pass a free-ship bill through the Congress of the United States while its political complexion is as now constituted. So much, then, for free ships, the very foundation of the overseas ship strength of every maritime power on earth.

To the champions and advocates of iniquitous subsidies, which at best are only a temporary relief, I reply that we never can help our shipbuilding industries and restore our merchant marine unless we adopt the policy of free ships or discriminate in some way in favor of our own ships and against foreign ships. The fact is that we discriminate now by law against our own ships in favor of foreign ships. My plan is simply to reverse the situation. I sincerely believe that in my bill for free ships or my bill for discriminating duties and tonnage taxes, or if the two should be combined on equitable lines and enacted into law, the United States in a few years would become the mistress of the seas and American ships, built in our own shipyards, would do all of our own ocean commerce, besides a great part of the deep-sea carrying trade of the other countries of the world without taking a dollar out of the pockets of the taxpayers.

Let me say, in conclusion, that the remedy I propose is not a makeshift. It is not a temporary expedient. It is permanent. It has been tried and not found wanting. It is the only solution of the problem. Adopted again as our policy and upon the statute books, it will never be repealed, but, on the contrary, speedily restore our ocean carrying trade, revive our shipbuilding indus-

tries, give employment in our shipyards to thousands and thousands of men in all parts of the country, bring about an era of prosperity such as we have never known before in our shipping trade and deep-sea commerce, place our flag on every sea and in every port, and make our seamen what they were in the historic days of the Republic—the pride of America and the masters of the ocean highways of the world.

Mr. BOWERS: Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BURKE].

[Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, on December 5, 1910, the first day of the session, I introduced a bill to change the date of the regular annual session of Congress, providing—

That Congress shall assemble in regular session once every year, and such meeting shall be on the 4th day of March instead of the first Monday in December.

This bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed, but it has not been reported back to the House. The Constitution of the United States provides that—

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

Congress has several times by law appointed a day for the meeting. The present Congress has full power to change the date for the next session, and the President can call an extraordinary session. It is clear to the mind of any dispassionate man that there should be no unnecessary delay on the part of Congress in carrying out the will of the people, as clearly expressed at the last election.

When a political party is intrusted with power it has no right to use that power merely for party advantage. It should respond strictly to the public will. A refusal to do so is a political crime of the highest order. When a popular government is dominated by special interests, which exploit its natural resources, monopolize its commerce, and wrest from the hand of labor the fruits of its toil, no further evidence is needed to prove corruption in high places. Such conditions are intolerable to a free and self-respecting people, and are incompatible with the perpetuity of the Republic.

Our country is so richly endowed by nature and the energy and intelligence of its citizenship have accomplished such amazing results in material production that a certain amount of prosperity has existed despite the monopolistic trusts and combines engendered and fostered by Republican misrule.

The election showed that the people of this country want a change of program, and especially so in reference to the tariff. Without taking up the time of this House unnecessarily, I appeal to its membership, regardless of party, to change the time of holding the next session of Congress to the 4th day of March, 1911, so that those who have been selected by the country to legislate can act as soon as possible, and give the needed relief.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I will.

Mr. HILL. I am one of those Republicans, a member of the Republican Party, to which the gentleman's appeal comes directly and personally, and I think that I have a right to ask, therefore, the gentleman that he will indicate precisely and in specific terms while he is now on his feet what the particular character and measure of relief is which he stands for, which he thinks would result in the benefit to the country to which he now alludes. I think we have a right to know that from the gentleman, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the next House.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I would not take the time to explain all of that matter—

Mr. HILL. I do not think the gentleman would.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I have not time to explain fully, but, briefly, the people meant for the Republicans to "get out." They repudiated the last tariff bill. They repudiated the Republican Party. The result of the last election was not a vote of confidence in the Democratic Party; it was a rebuke to the Republican Party and its administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The tariff law ought to be revised so that the cost of living can be reduced. It ought to be revised to the basis of a revenue tariff; but time forbids me to go into the various items and details; the gentleman ought to know that; he is on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HILL. Now, what particular changes would you make?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. If the gentleman will allow me—

Mr. HILL. I would like for the gentleman to particularize, and I would like to know. I have wanted an answer to that for

the last four months, and I do not believe the party or any Democrat knows what they would do.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given sufficient time to answer.

Mr. COX of Ohio. Might it not be suggested for the information of the gentleman from New England—

Mr. HILL. What I am looking for is information

Mr. COX of Ohio (continuing). That one of the important things to be done will be the bringing of light into the making up of the cotton and woolen schedules?

Mr. HILL. I am in favor of it.

Mr. COX of Ohio. And ascertaining to what extent self-interest entered into them?

Mr. HILL. And all other schedules, too. I am in favor of it.

Mr. COX of Ohio. And for the information of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BURKE], it might be stated that the Rules Committee now is apparently afraid to bring onto the floor of this House a resolution seeking to investigate the operations of some of his constituents, namely, the Steel Trust. Those are two specific measures of relief.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman yield for a minute?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. HILL. I would like to hear it, even from the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RANDELL] has expired.

Mr. BOWERS. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. SULZER. I introduced a bill to take the tariff from meats and want the Committee on Ways and Means, of which the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] is a member, to report that bill and give the House a chance to vote upon it. Do I understand the gentleman from Connecticut is in favor of that bill?

Mr. HILL. I am, and have been since 1900; and told my people in the presidential campaign of that year that I was in favor of free fresh meat, and I shall vote for it when I get a chance.

Mr. SULZER. Good for you. You and I agree upon that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to ask if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RANDELL] will favor putting fresh meat on the free list.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I will vote against the Beef Trust every time I get a chance; I will vote against the Lumber Trust every time I get a chance.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman favor putting fresh meat on the free list?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I have never been in favor of anything else.

It has been asked, What was the meaning of the people as indicated by the results of the last election? I think they meant that it was time for them to take charge of their own Government again. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I think they meant that the Republican Party had proven false to its promises. I think they meant that the Republican Party, when it promised to revise the tariff and to revise it in the interest of the people, had ruthlessly failed to do so. [Applause on the Democratic side.] As to what we can do, we will see whether or not we can reduce the price of food where that price is increased by law. We will endeavor to give the people an opportunity for cheaper clothing, especially the poorer people, where the price is enhanced by law. We will endeavor to give free lumber, so that the people can build their homes, as they can not do now. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We will endeavor to decrease the price of living where the increased expense comes from the brutal power of law and not from natural sources. But the question before this House, and the one I am talking about, is this: What right have you to refuse to take such action as you can to let the representatives of the people meet as soon as possible to enact the laws they have been instructed to pass? Why will you stand in the way? You have been honored, you have been trusted, you have been weighed in the balance and found wanting. The people have turned from you to the Democratic Party. Will you obstruct the action of the people? Will you say to them, You can repudiate us if you will, but we will let the effect of our misrule stand as long as possible? Will you say to them that the result of your work, which is unsatisfactory to them, shall remain and that the interests which have been controlling this Congress will continue to gather their ill-gotten gains for another year? If you do, I tell you that an outraged public will, when the next election comes, sweep you not only from this House but from the Senate and the Presidency as well.

[Loud applause on the Democratic side.] I am not here to condemn any man because of his party affiliations, and no matter to what party he belongs his country should stand first. Anyone who refuses to obey the will of the people is unworthy of trust and should be driven from the public service. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. I would like the gentleman from Mississippi to be really good, because he is coming into power soon, and yield me a little Democratic time—about 10 minutes.

Mr. BOWERS. I will have to ask the gentleman to get his time from the other side.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman from Michigan says he has none to give out.

Mr. BOWERS. When he has consumed some of his time remaining, if the time falls for him in discussing the bill, I will endeavor to give the gentleman some time.

Mr. HILL. I will ask unanimous consent to be allowed 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. That matter has been determined by the House.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. With the understanding—

Mr. BOWERS. I will ask the gentleman to allow me to yield time further on this side.

Mr. HILL. I want to answer right now.

Mr. BOWERS. I want to give opportunity for gentlemen to extend their remarks in the RECORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there have been reports in circulation here and elsewhere that there was internal trouble back in Ohio. I want to deny the charge, and to state that the supposed disaffection has been greatly magnified in the press and otherwise. We are always together in Ohio on vital questions. As an evidence of this statement, I want to call your attention to the fact that my good friends, the distinguished ex-Speaker of this House, Gen. KEIFER, and the gallant old Roman who lives on the banks of the Maumee, Gen. SHERWOOD, are agreed in their opposition to the fortification of the Panama Canal. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BOWERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, as the District appropriation bill is under discussion, it is eminently fitting and proper to make some observations. In the first place, the people of the District have a just cause of complaint against Congress for neglecting legislation affecting their interests.

Monday last regular District day was side-stepped to give post office and post roads another day at court. No harm would have resulted had that appropriation bill gone over for one day. On a roll call 191 Members voted to take Monday from the Committee on the District of Columbia, as fixed by the regular order of business in the House, while 105 stood to have the 30 bills on the calendar affecting the people of Washington taken up and considered.

It seems an injustice to citizens of the District to treat them in this uncereceronious way. Sooner or later they will demand representation in the House so that some one may have an opportunity to make their claims known and fight for a hearing.

In my judgment this is the only solution of the problem, and when the people of this city demand it with a united voice it will be heeded.

I desire to say something on the bill—teachers' retirement in the District—which would have had the right of way on Monday last if the committee had not been sidetracked. In an experience of 20 years in educational matters in the splendid schools of the city of New York I am convinced of the necessity of retiring teachers who have been worn out or broken down in their arduous duties.

No profession is so exacting, demands so great a vitality, such a high order of ability, and so much patience as that of the public-school teacher. Nearly 20 years ago, as a commissioner of education in that city, I found more than 100 teachers, who had faithfully and conscientiously taught from 30 to 50 years, broken down and unfit for the classroom, yet compelled to continue in order to live.

It was inhuman to force them to do so, and a gross injustice to the pupils under them. This, after all, is the real purpose of a retirement bill, as the schools are maintained for the children, the future men and women of the Republic.

In New York the retirement roll contained, February 1, 1910, 64 men and 1,052 women, a total of 1,116. On January 1, 1911, the total number on the roll was 1,152, costing \$840,055.27. It has proven highly satisfactory and of incalculable benefit to the schools.

I desire to add as a part of my remarks excerpts from the annual report of the secretary of the board of retirement of February, 1910, and ask for it careful consideration.

REASONS FOR RETIREMENT.

There were 127 teachers retired during the year ending February 1, 1910. Of these, 46, or more than one-third the whole number, were suffering from neurasthenia, or nervous breakdown; 18 were retired on account of service and age; 16 had serious heart disease; 6 were retired on account of general debility; 4 on account of senility; 4 were suffering from tuberculosis. Others were retired on account of rheumatism, deafness, deficient sight, nephritis, digestion troubles, bronchitis, locomotor ataxia, and other causes.

There have appeared before the board of retirement during the first five years of its existence, as shown elsewhere, 562 applicants for retirement. Of these, 219, or 39 per cent, were suffering from complete nervous breakdown or other serious nervous affection; 61 were suffering from heart disease, 17 from tuberculosis, and 15 were insane or otherwise mentally unbalanced; 56 applied on the plea of age or length of service. The other 194 were suffering from various troubles, including nearly every complication possible to affect persons engaged in the trying work of teaching.

The statement of causes for retirement given above, indicating, as it does, the very great hazards of the teaching profession, will surprise most people who harp upon the "easy" work of teachers. It is said that Germany has the best schools in the world, and the German teachers have been pensioned about 100 years. The argument advanced in Germany by the Government in favor of pensioning teachers is that teachers, of all State officers, are the ones who deserve the highest consideration, and they are the ones who are most likely to sacrifice their health in the discharge of their duties. In Germany a teacher who has rounded out 50 years of service is retired on full salary. The late president of Chicago University, Dr. Harper, once said:

"The number of physical wrecks furnished by the profession of teaching is certainly larger in proportion than that of any other calling in life. In no other work can it be so truly said that the toiler gives forth his own strength to the one for whom he toils."

Those of us who have spent our lives in the schoolroom are not at all surprised at these statements. We know of innumerable cases of physical breakdown and nervous prostration due entirely to close application to duty in stuffy and improperly cleaned and poorly ventilated schoolrooms, filled with children who often transmit disease not only to their classmates, but to their teachers. The teachers often have not the power of resistance to disease which the more active children possess. When one realizes that it is becoming more and more certain that the schoolroom is the distributing center for the contagious diseases of a community, the extra hazardous character of our profession becomes indeed alarming. I have in mind one Brooklyn teacher, with wife and four children, as well as two of his sisters living at his home. He carried home from his school diphtheria and scarlet fever, and now there remain of his family himself and one son. His wife, three children, and his sisters have been offered up as a sacrifice to his labor in the school.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BOWERS. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES].

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I desire to have this article from a newspaper read from the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks that the matter that he has sent to the Clerk's desk may be read in his time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Mississippi to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

The CHAIRMAN. He did.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much time?

The CHAIRMAN. Two minutes. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LABOR MEN GUILTY—CHARGED WITH CONSPIRACY TO INTERFERE WITH COMMERCE—STRIKE OF COAL WHEELERS.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., January 25.

Organized labor to-day felt the restraining force of the Sherman anti-trust law when a jury in the United States circuit court here returned a verdict of guilty against members of the New Orleans Dock and Cotton Council, charged with conspiracy to interfere with foreign commerce.

COUNCIL HAS 50,000 MEMBERS.

The dock and cotton council has about 50,000 members. From the moment a bale of cotton or load of lumber or any other through freight reaches the port until it has been stowed on a vessel it is not handled by anyone except the members of 10 or more unions affiliated with the central body. Those that unload a bale of cotton, those that haul it to a cotton press, those that are employed to compress it, those that haul it to the pier, those that stack it on the pier, those that mark the various bales, those that carry it aboard ship, and those that arrange it in the hold are all members of various unions, known as drivers, handlers, yardmen, mark men, screw men, etc.

THE GOVERNMENT'S CONTENTION.

It was argued by the Government's attorneys that when these men conspired to strike and tie up the port they interfered with interstate commerce.

The convicted men are James Byrnes, former president of the council and at present State labor commissioner of Louisiana; Philip Pearsaw, former president of the local Coal Wheelers' Union; and U. S. Swan, former president of the Longshoremen's Union. Swan and Pearsaw are negroes. Sentence has been deferred.

The strike, which was begun two years ago, grew out of the refusal of the Coal Wheelers' Union to coal the steamer *Habib* because nonunion longshoremen had been employed to load the vessel.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I simply had that article read into the RECORD this morning for the purpose of calling it to the attention of gentlemen who insisted when this matter limiting the appropriation for prosecutions under the Sherman antitrust act law was up last session, who took the

stand that there could never be any possible occasion on which that appropriation could be used as it has been in this instance. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD the remarks I made yesterday on the subject of the United States courts.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OLCOTT].

[Mr. OLCOTT addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, before we get "swept out," for I believe that is the term used by the gentleman from Texas, I would like to say a word or two in regard to the Payne tariff bill. First, I will reply to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER], who asks me if I am in favor of free fresh meat. I am, and have been for 10 years.

Mr. SULZER. Good! [Applause.]

Mr. HILL. I want to say to the gentlemen on that side that if they make a revenue tariff law on the basis of the Wilson bill or on any revenue basis which will meet the expenses of the Government, the duty on fresh meat will be higher than it is now under the Payne bill, or was under the Dingley law.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. We will not do that.

Mr. HILL. Under the Wilson bill the duty was 20 per cent ad valorem; it was 2 cents under the Dingley law, and the Payne bill reduced it 25 per cent, to 1½ cents a pound. It does not require a very high character of mathematical education to understand that 20 per cent on the pending prices of meat would be more than the duty under the Payne bill.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I will say to the gentleman that if the bill sent over to the Senate by the new Democratic House is not butchered in a Republican Senate like the Wilson bill was it will be a Democratic measure when passed.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the gentleman that the Senate which butchered it had a majority against the Republican Party.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. In name only.

Mr. HILL. In fact, I want to say further that when the Dingley law went over from this House hides were free and were made dutiable in the Senate by a Democratic Senate.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. A so-called Democratic Senate.

Mr. HILL. Oh, the gentleman can say "so called," but it was, as a matter of fact, by three majority.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Did not a Republican Senate vote with the three Democrats?

Mr. HILL. I do not know; I know that the Republican Party in the Senate could not have passed the bill.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. They and the three Democrats did. It was a Republican outrage assisted by a Democratic outrage. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. I know further that a Democratic Senate put crude oil also at an advanced rate, in spite of the desire of Mr. Wilson to have it free in the House.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. The trouble was that the Republican Party in the Senate butchered the bill with the aid of some Democratic assassins. The Democratic Party was all right.

Mr. HILL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention in all good faith to this proposition. There are three kinds of tariffs we are considering in this country. First, English free trade. What is it? It is a high duty on luxuries, and everything else free. Then there is a tariff for revenue only. What is it? It is a high duty on luxuries, and everything else at the lowest possible rate that will bring in money enough to pay the expenses of the Government. Then there is the protective tariff. What is it? It is a high duty on luxuries, the same as the other two, and an equalizing duty on competitive products, making equal competition on those products, and everything else free. That is a fair definition of all three. Now, I want to apply it to the Payne bill. The first year of the Payne bill our importations amounted to \$1,562,621,181. Of that amount \$768,047,231, almost exactly one-half of it, was absolutely free; not a penny of tax against it in any way, shape, or manner. In addition to that there were importations of \$250,900,000 worth of luxuries—not classified by me as luxuries, but classified by the Treasury Department as luxuries. Add that to your free goods and there is \$1,018,947,231 out of the \$1,562,000,000 com-

ing into this country under the Payne law during its first year, absolutely on the basis of English free trade—two-thirds of the entire amount. Is that what you want to change? Do you want to change that two-thirds?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: What does he think the people repudiated when they voted at the last election?

Mr. HILL. I am coming to that. I want to get the way clear. Does the gentleman want to change the two-thirds of the entire importation under the Payne law that came in here on an English free-trade basis? Do you? I am asking you a square question.

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. I want to change the whole plan. Mr. HILL. Do you want to put a revenue duty on the \$1,018,000,000 worth of goods?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Most of it; no.

Mr. HILL. What part do you?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Do you want me to give you a schedule?

Mr. HILL. Then, you will let the \$1,018,000,000 alone.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. For a question.

Mr. HARDY. Does not the gentleman think that the ideas of the people at the last election, whatever they are, ought to be carried out?

Mr. HILL. I certainly do, as an object lesson; but it is the denunciation of the gentleman from Texas that I am replying to.

Mr. HARDY. Then the gentleman is in favor of the Democratic program. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL. Oh, but you have been going through the country denouncing the Payne law in toto, and all of its features, and I want you to have at least a partial comprehension of them. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I am asking you now, Will you change that ten hundred and eighteen millions of importations and put a revenue duty on them?

Mr. HARDY. Are you in favor of giving the people's Representatives a chance?

Mr. HILL. Absolutely; I am one of them. Now, then, I have given you ten hundred and eighteen millions—

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. If I have time I will, but I want to press this home to you now. That leaves \$543,000,000 of competitive importations. Now, then, of that there was one hundred and twenty-five millions—

Mr. HARDY. I just wanted to ask—

Mr. HILL. Wait a moment, wait a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield for the present.

Mr. HILL. Five hundred and forty-three millions of competitive importations. Of that there were two hundred and fifty millions in the sundries schedule, in the wood schedule, and in the paper and pulp schedule. The lumber schedule averaged 10.78, which is far below your revenue rates. Do you want to reduce that? The wood and pulp and paper schedule averaged 20.02 per cent. That is below your rate necessary for revenue purposes. Do you want to reduce that? The sundries schedule—

Mr. GARNER of Texas. What does the gentleman mean by a revenue rate?

Mr. HILL. A rate low enough to raise money enough to meet the necessary expenses of this Government.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Do you mean that the wood and the pulp schedule is lower than the revenue rate?

Mr. HILL. I mean that it is lower than any Democratic tariff that ever was enacted on a revenue basis from the beginning of the Government down to now.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. But the change of prices makes a difference with reference to a revenue rate.

Mr. HILL. That is what I said about the meat schedule a few moments ago. Your actual taxes, with an ad valorem revenue rate, will be higher than the specific duties of the Dingley law and the Payne law. Mr. Chairman, I have come down to five hundred and forty-three millions. Two hundred and fifty millions of that in these three schedules average below the revenue basis to-day. Why, the importations under the sundries schedule are more than those under both the woolen and cotton schedules.

Mr. BURLESON. Oh, you cooked up those figures.

Mr. HILL. I did cook them and they are well cooked. But there are two hundred and ninety millions more. Of that one hundred and twenty-five millions is sugar. I refer to raw sugar only. Are you going to take that off?

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. There ought to be some of it taken off.

Mr. HILL. It is a purely revenue duty. It is the biggest revenue producer that we have and gives us eighty millions a year. What are you going to put in place of it? Will you offset the reduction on sugar by adding to farm products or manufactured products or by putting a duty on those things now on the free list? That takes one hundred and twenty-five millions more from your importations. Now, that brings us down to one hundred and sixty-eight millions that you perhaps have a right to criticize, and why do you not do it? Why do you not come out fair and square and say what it is? Why do you continually and eternally denounce this thing as a whole, when the biggest part of it to-day is rated lower than you ever dared to make a duty when you were in power in this country? [Applause on the Republican side.]

So I have brought it down to one hundred and sixty-eight millions, and I say to you now—

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I say to you that this Republican administration now has pending before this Congress a proposition to fairly and honestly and scientifically investigate these disputed questions, and ascertain whether the true principle of protection is found in its dealings with them or not. The point about the case is simply this—

Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. You want to destroy the protective principle. That is what you are after. You want to absolutely annihilate the protective principle, and so without coming down to specifications you denounce the whole thing without rhyme or reason. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROTHERMEL].

[Mr. ROTHERMEL addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BOWERS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] for 15 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself to the bill that is now before this House for consideration, and in doing so I wish at the outset to say that there is no man in or out of this country who desires the success, prosperity, and advancement of the city of Washington more than I do. I wish the Capital of this Nation to be made the most beautiful city in all the world, but when that is done I wish it to be done at a legitimate cost and expense, and not through methods of wastefulness. Now, in this bill, among the early items, is one simply to take care of the District Building, down here at Fourteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. I do not wish to talk about the salaries of the various clerks, commissioners, and other officials of the District there quartered, but I say that for the care of that building there is provision made in this bill for 80 specific employees. Eighty people are specifically provided for in salaries under the provisions of this bill, simply to take care of that one building. Then, under a blanket clause, immediately following the provision for these 80 people, innumerable more may be employed from a fund set aside for that purpose.

Under the Metropolitan police provision of this bill 934 positions are specifically provided for, where there is another blanket clause that innumerable men may be employed out of other funds in addition to those 934. In the fire department 472 specific places are provided for; and, under this bill, the Commissioners of the District and others with appointing power are given authority to appoint 4,672 people to office; and then, under several blanket clauses, those may be doubled or trebled, until now we have in this District, for District work alone, an army of ten or twelve thousand people upon the public pay rolls, for one-half of which the United States Government pays; yet we hear a clamor through the press and from the residents of this District that they are "niggardly dealt with." I say they are more liberally dealt with in every respect than in any other State, county, or city in the whole United States. We hear a great clamor that there is not sufficient desk room in the schools for the children. Maj. Judson, the engineer commissioner of the District, says that there are now 7,500 vacant seats; and, if there are not—and every man must admit there are many—I say that the liberality of the United States Government in providing seats to the children who arrive at the school age every year in this District is unsurpassed anywhere else on earth. New buildings that have been appropriated for during the last five years have cost \$2,839,000.

The school board says that the yearly increase of children is 750 pupils. That I deny, and if I had time I could establish the fact that the yearly increase is nearer 500 than it is 750;

but, admitting for the sake of argument, that the yearly increase is 750—that is, on a five-year basis—we spend \$557 to make desk room alone for each and every one of these 750 children who come into the school age. If it were brought down to 500, an increase nearer the proper figure, annually for the past five years, the sitting capacity alone for each of these children would cost \$1,135 a year. Now, some may say that that only relates to the last year or two; but taking it for the last five years, and on the basis of 750 children who arrive at the school age each year, that would be a cost of \$450 for desk room alone for each of those 750 children; and if we come down to what is more approximately correct, that the increase is about 500 a year, then you spend \$700 a year for each child, for desk room alone, who comes into the school age.

Next year, on the basis of 750 children coming into the school age, it will cost each of the new children for desk room alone \$806. On the basis of 500, which I contend is nearer correct, desk room alone will cost each child \$1,210; and I say that there has been provision made during the last recent years for children who come into the school age for desk room alone enough money to build a good three-room cottage for any of the poor people around this section. The amount thus allowed for desk room for each child will erect a building of that description anywhere. Now, then, when we have to consider the charge of being niggardly, which is made, I say that Congress is more liberal toward the schools and toward every department of the Government than can be found anywhere else on earth.

In these reports it is shown that within the last 22 years the salaries of the teachers have been increased 400 per cent, while the school children have increased only 50 per cent. Here we have teachers provided for in specific number.

I do not wish to say that an additional number is willfully concealed, but I say that an additional number of 84 teachers has been so managed in the report that they do not show to the casual observer, and those are the teachers in the night schools. We have here in one report where, in addition to the one thousand seven hundred and sixty-odd teachers employed, 84 were in the night schools, and they were paid \$2.15 a night. In that way, whether intentionally or otherwise, these reports have been juggled.

Mr. BOWERS. May I ask the gentleman what report he refers to?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. To one of the very latest I could get hold of.

Mr. BOWERS. I mean the report of what body?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The school board.

Mr. BOWERS. I simply wanted him to be specific on that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Now, Mr. Chairman, another item: Sixty-odd thousand dollars are appropriated under this bill to buy books and supplies for the school children of this District. There is no provision made that this shall be spent alone for the indigent children. This money is spent as well for the children of the millionaires who flock from all over the country into the District as for the indigent children. We have the millionaires' children furnished with books and supplies at the public expense in this city, where it is done nowhere else that I know of. I am in favor of furnishing books and supplies for the indigent children, but I am against the proposition that the man who moves into this District that he may escape taxation, or that he may escape inheritance tax after his death, shall gain the benefit of this. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In this report of the school board, they report at one time they bought \$3,800 worth of lead pencils. I suppose that purchase must have happened immediately after they had burned for kindling wood \$3,000 worth of furniture, as was charged in the papers. Another item is, that at one time this commission bought between \$1,100 and \$1,200 worth of pen points. These pencils, I say—\$3,800 worth of them, bought at one time—will make kindling wood for the next few years for these schools.

Now, then, the average increase of school-teachers in this District for a great number of years has been 49. This year the number is somewhat reduced, but when you come to examine you will find that there is a provision in the bill which says that no school-teacher shall be assigned to duty as a clerk or as librarian. The teachers who have heretofore been assigned to that work are now given clerkships under this bill, still kept on the pay roll; and, consequently, the number of teachers is increased only about 16, I believe.

Now, as I said at the beginning, Mr. Chairman, I wished to call attention to a few of these items before this bill is brought up for passage, that each Member for himself may inquire into the question as to whether or not this Congress is niggardly and stingy with the people of the District of Columbia, or whether or not it is the most liberal on earth.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KENDALL). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BOWERS. I yield one minute more, then, to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. COX of Ohio. Is it true that in the operations of the District Committee this important fact has been developed, namely, that in the building of roadways and construction of gutterings, sidewalks, and so forth, the rule prevalent everywhere else in this country of assessing tax against the abutting property owner is not followed here?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, in all other cities of this land the abutting property holder must pay for the improvements to streets and sidewalks. Such is not the case in this city, but when the benefits adjudged against abutting property is not of sufficient value to pay for those improvements a great zone is created, taxing the people of that zone to improve a certain street in which they have no interest and on which their property does not abut in order that somebody else may have the benefit of Government money.

Mr. COX of Ohio. Is it not true, also, that Massachusetts Avenue was continued away out apparently 2 or 3 miles beyond the logical city limits—there are no city limits, of course, but the limit of residential construction—at a cost of untold thousands of dollars, and that no assessment was made against the property holders therefor—the nabobs out on the hill—the people of Kentucky and of Ohio and other States paying part of the cost of a project which had no purpose apparently in view except the exploitation of land in that particular part of the District?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is true; and, in addition to that, I wish to say that Sixteenth Street has been extended where property was condemned at a cost of more than three-quarters of a million, and bridges were built. The whole extension of Sixteenth Street cost a million and a half of dollars. To lead where? Into a piece of thick woodland, beyond which extension, as far as the human eye can reach, not a residence of any description was then nor is now in sight, all to enhance the value of private holders at the expense of the public.

Mr. COX of Ohio. I ask the gentleman further, whether it is not true, as developed in the inquiries carried on by the District Committee, that the cost of maintaining the fire and police departments in the city of Washington is two or three times as much as it is in large commercial centers of equal size elsewhere in the country. We not long ago developed the discrepancy as between Washington and Milwaukee, especial attention being called to the triple cost in the conduct of the fire department. It was sought to justify this upon the ground that increased facilities were necessary here, because of the public records reposing in fireproof buildings. At the same time we called attention to the fact that, approximately speaking, there are no large manufacturing plants in the city of Washington requiring fire facilities such as are necessary in other cities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOWERS. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. COX of Ohio. That is the situation, is it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. My information is that the gentleman is absolutely correct in that. I wish to go back further relative to this bill, just for one moment. In this bill there is a provision giving the commissioners of the District the right to open streets. That right, some gentlemen said yesterday, should never come upon the floor of this House. I say that it should; and it is one of the most important questions relative to the District of Columbia that does come here. When one of these streets has been officially opened, follow your appropriation bills, and invariably thereafter you will find great sums of money appropriated to macadamize it. Last session we had contention after contention upon this floor relative to the opening of streets in a broad farm 7 miles to the north of us.

The argument was made that this farm should be cut up so that the poorer classes could have homes. I say it ought to be, but it ought to be cut up and sold to these people before it is improved at Government expense. When it is cut up and the Government has completed the macadamized roads and pavements through it, then the land shark comes in and sells it to these poor people, not for the reasonable price he should have asked them for it before the Government money was put into it, but he adds the Government money to the extortionate price he asks for the land, and then sells it to the poor people of this community who seek homes. [Loud applause.]

Mr. BOWERS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a paper of mine appearing in the August issue of Popular Mechanics on the subject of aeroplanes and

battleships, in connection with the remarks that I made on the Army appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I shall not undertake to answer the criticisms of the gentleman from Kentucky, because most of them are matters of existing law or matters that should be considered by the legislative committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the time of the gentleman from Michigan is exhausted.

Mr. BOWERS. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. In so far as the Appropriations Committee are concerned, they have endeavored to follow the law and to be as economical as the current conditions in their judgment would warrant. I may say in this connection, that while the appropriation for the next fiscal year is the largest which has ever been made for current expenses, it is more than half a million dollars less than was asked by the commissioners, and at the same time is more than half a million in excess of that for the present fiscal year. The finances of the District, in so far as debts are concerned, are in the best shape since we have lived under the present organic law. A few years ago the interest on the floating debt was \$80,000 a year; this year it is \$49,000. A few years ago the floating debt was almost exactly \$4,000,000. This year it will be about \$2,400,000, and it is in process of rapid extinguishment. The funded debt is being extinguished according to law, from year to year, and will soon pass entirely away. The revenues of the District are constantly increasing, so that the current affairs of the District and permanent improvements desired can be carried on out of the current revenue, as it is believed.

There are some things in this bill, Mr. Chairman, that I think ought to be called to the special attention of the House. More than any other bill, since my connection with the committee, this bill deals with what may be called the public utilities.

First, I may call attention to the limitations made on pages 3, 4, and 5, and others following in their course in the report. I wish to call attention particularly to the municipal asphalt plant that this bill authorizes. Your committee believe that it was wise to take this action, and so recommend to the House, because, among other reasons, there have been hitherto two or more competing companies for business in asphalt work. Recently the companies have combined, and to-day there is but one company doing that kind of work in the District of Columbia. For repairs and for new work the District is paying out now in excess of half a million dollars annually, one of the large items in the bill. It is believed that in the interest of economy the establishment of this plant, if in the discretion of the commissioners it shall seem best, will work for the interest of the District.

Then there is another reason why your committee believe that it may be established in the interest of economy, namely, that the recent change of the prisoners of the District to a location on the reservation at Occoquan, a tract of land on which is a large stone quarry from which a practically inexhaustible supply can be obtained and used as a basis for streets, if the commissioners so desire.

Again, there will be established there a municipal brick plant, where bricks can be made and used, if they are allowed to, for the paving of streets, alleys, and gutters, as their judgment shall dictate. So that it is believed by your committee that they can operate this plant under certain conditions that may arise for the advantage of the District.

Another limitation is in regard to street sweeping. In this bill the commissioners are authorized, if in their judgment they deem it best, to perform wholly the sweeping of the streets. It is now divided in part between private contractors and the commissioners. The commissioners, in order to perform the part allotted to them to keep the streets clean of snow and ice, have already enlarged considerably their equipment. They will have to enlarge it still more if they carry out the provisions that are contemplated in the other House.

So that if this work is turned over to the commissioners it is thought the streets will be kept in better condition, and also at less expense than they are now. I may say that there have been two controlling motives in the action of the committee in framing this bill: First, what will bring the best results to the city? and, second, how can they be obtained at the least expenditure of money? It is on these principles that we have endeavored to frame the bill.

The next limitation begins at the bottom of page 5 and runs through page 6 and a part of page 7, and refers to the reorganization of what may be called the penal system, the care of the prisoners of the District. It will be remembered that some

years ago the commissioners were authorized—after careful investigation had been made by a commission named by the President of the United States in obedience to the law of Congress that set forth what in its judgment was best to be done—the commissioners were authorized to purchase two tracts of land lying either in the State of Virginia or the State of Maryland, respectively, or both in either State if the latter could be done to better advantage.

Very careful investigation of the situation was made, and as a result two tracts of land—both lying within the State of Virginia—have been purchased, one bordering on the Occoquan Creek, about 30 miles from the city. That tract of land, it has been determined, shall be the home of the prisoners committed to the workhouse. The other tract selected is down here some 6½ or 7 miles from Mount Vernon, depending on where you strike the tract, if you go by land. If you go by water, the nearest point to Mount Vernon is 3½ to 4½ or 5 miles—5 miles to where the buildings will be located. This bill provides the appropriation to carry on the work at both tracts in obedience to the law of Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The tract that the gentleman last speaks of is the Belvoir tract?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has that tract been actually acquired by the Government?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I understand it has been acquired and paid for, or, at least, the money deposited.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not in process of condemnation now?

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. I think I can answer the gentleman. Condemnation proceedings have been completed, and the money has been paid in pursuance to the order of the court.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would like the gentleman in charge of the bill to state what, if any, consideration the committee has given to the popular prejudice, and, as I think, a well-founded prejudice, against having a penal institution within 3 miles of Mount Vernon.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to answer the gentleman's question. I will say that the committee has given most careful consideration, so much so that the subcommittee personally went to Mount Vernon by trolley, and took carriages there, and at a slow trot for 6 miles—the best that the horses could do—and a walk of one-half hour, we reached Belvoir in 1 hour and 30 minutes from Mount Vernon. We went through a country partially wooded and partially cleared, until we got near the tract, when we struck a dense forest of three thousand or more acres. We went down from the main highway, a little out from the woods, onto a ridge that slopes both ways, the one toward Mount Vernon and the other toward a small creek that empties into a little bay making up from the river, and followed that some time—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know the location very well.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Now, the reformatory is to be put on the farther slope of that tract of land.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Farthest from here?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Farthest from here.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is, the nearest from Mount Vernon.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. No; the farthest from Mount Vernon, Mount Vernon lying between us and the tract. The gentleman will see at once that if you put it farthest from us it must be farthest from Mount Vernon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may be entirely mistaken, but I thought the Mount Vernon tract was the next peninsula down the river from Belvoir.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. It is just the other way. Belvoir is below Mount Vernon, and the slope on which they propose to locate the reformatory is the farthest from Mount Vernon. The slope on this side is wooded, but that does not belong to the Government, nor has any attempt been made, so far as I know, to purchase it by the Government. It is over 6 miles, the nearest you can get there by public highway, and you can not walk back nor drive back in any other way, for there is a bay which makes up on this side of the tract, on the slope toward Mount Vernon, and a stream empties into that, so that a pedestrian or horseman or carriage or automobile must go clear around from 6 to 7½ or 8 miles.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It stands on a peninsula sticking out into the river the same as Mount Vernon?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And in a direct line they are only 3 miles apart?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. As the bird flies, from 3½ to 4 miles from where the reformatory would be located.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It seems to me a rather unfortunate selection that the next beautiful site on the river from Mount Vernon should be chosen by the Government of the United States for a penal institution.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman also think it unfortunate that right within hailing distance of the Capitol and the White House we have people who violate the laws?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do; but to segregate those people all in one place and to have them scattered throughout the city under police protection are two very different things.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. But I would say to the gentleman on that point, it would seem unfortunate to have located within 1 mile of this Capitol an almshouse, a workhouse, a United States jail, a District jail, a psychopathic ward for the treatment of undesirable citizens—to use a somewhat hackneyed word—a smallpox hospital, a crematory, all in plain sight of the dome of the Capitol and within 2½ miles of the President of the United States in his official home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOWERS. I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will simply say, if the gentleman will permit me, that of course in a great metropolis like Washington we have to put these institutions, the Capitol, the White House, and various other institutions which the gentleman has enumerated, somewhat near together.

It seems to me it was not necessary, in my judgment, and from a purely sentimental standpoint I think it is unfortunate, that the sentiment of the country should be violated by establishing upon this picturesque headland next to Mount Vernon a penal institution.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I will say that my time is limited and we can reach that in its proper place in the bill.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that at the proper time, when this item is reached in the bill, I shall have something to say on the subject and try to show that there is not any good reason why the city of Washington should not take care of its own prisoners, poorhouse, and jail without sending them over to Virginia to be taken care of there.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. There is another matter connected with this item of great importance to which I desire to call attention, and that is the change in the care and control of the prisoners themselves. We have here a sort of double-headed system of Federal and District control. Out here at the jail, this large brownstone building, east or northeast of the Capitol, is what is called the jail. Adjacent to that is the workhouse. The workhouse is under the control of the District Commissioners. There have been sent prisoners, male and female, sentenced in the District courts to that institution. At the Washington Asylum the commissioners appoint the warden and all subordinate officers. Over in the jail the warden is appointed by Federal authority and his subordinates are appointed and confirmed by Federal authority. Now, in this readjustment the prisoners have all been removed from the Washington Asylum to what is called the workhouse, except the women prisoners, and they will be as soon as quarters can be furnished them at Occoquan. Now we have there an asylum, simply a hospital and a psychopathic ward, that must for a time be maintained and looked after, and some other things there in connection with the plant. There is the United States jail, which has its own warden and outfit. The committee have given careful investigation and believe that one warden can supervise all as well as two wardens, and in the management save to the District and the Government in round numbers \$25,000, and put the whole control of the prisoners, after they leave the court and are sentenced, under the control of the commissioners, and those that may happen to be in transit to the reformatory and until they pass out from under the surveillance of the law.

The Attorney General, I understand, has agreed to that. The only point in question is whether you shall consolidate and save this \$25,000, or whether you will continue the double-headed administration. On page 5 of the report is another important item of four lines:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are empowered to effect a settlement for arc lighting under the existing contract with the Potomac Electric Power Co. from the date of said contract to the date of approval of this act.

This has been a very perplexing and troublesome question to the committee. Some nine or 10 years ago there was instituted here a system of open arc lighting. The city was to pay for each lamp as being of 1,000 candlepower, and did pay on that basis through a series of years, until the present commissioners ascertained that the District was not having now, and had not had, the 1,000 candlepower, but, as near as it could

be estimated, about 700 candlepower. As soon as they discovered the discrepancy they withheld payment, and they have withheld payment ever since November, and are now waiting to arrive at a satisfactory adjustment of the condition. The matter was brought to the attention of the Potomac Electric Power Co., and it was urged by the representatives of that concern that former commissioners had accepted the closed arc light, and had not only accepted it, but had requested its institution and substitution for the open arc after the Potomac Electric Power Co. had put a number here in commission and ascertained that they gave a very much better light. This ran along for some time and everybody conceded that the closed arc light was much better than the open arc light. I may say that when the open arc light was first instituted it was declared that there was no photometer that was capable of ascertaining the exact measure of light. There was a moment occasionally when at its greatest brilliancy it would reach the maximum of 1,000 candlepower. Now, that went along for some time, for some years, under the closed arc light, when in the process of developing the electric light it was found that what is called the magnetite lamp would give a still better light, and those were brought to the city and some were put in commission; and they were so much more satisfactory than the closed arc that one or two of the commissioners requested repeatedly, indeed, ordered, as represented to us, that the magnetite lamp be substituted for the closed arc. The magnetite in use is of about 700 candlepower.

But during all these years the District had been paying for 1,000 candlepower. It is represented that the cost of changing from one light to another was imposed upon the plant and, on the other hand, it was conceded that the care of the open arc light was much more costly in the course of the year than either the closed arc light or the magnetite, and that there was an offset.

Now, the District is in this condition: It has been paying for nine or 10 years for 1,000 candlepower when it has only received about 700 candlepower. The attention of the authorities of the Potomac Electric Co. had been called repeatedly to this discrepancy—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TILSON). The gentleman's additional time has expired.

Mr. BOWERS. How much time is there remaining to me?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has five minutes remaining.

Mr. BOWERS. I will give you four minutes more.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. On the other hand, it is represented that this change had been made at the earnest solicitation of one or more of the District Commissioners. The upshot of the whole thing is that we have had a better light—if I may have the attention of the gentleman—

Mr. BOWERS. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him, I wish to say I will yield to him the remaining time.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. The upshot of the whole thing is that we have had a better light, both under the closed arc and magnetite lamps, than we had at any time under the open arc light. At the same time we have only gotten in candlepower seven-tenths of what we have paid for. Now, here is the situation: This bill authorizes the present District Commissioners, who, I may say, had nothing to do with the previous arrangement and under whose administration this discrepancy has been discovered, and under whose action payment has been withheld until a settlement has been effected, to make a settlement with the Potomac Electric Power Co., they understanding the whole situation.

Again, with regard to the electric lighting, the District Commissioners have gone into a readjustment of the whole lighting business, and it is believed have made a very fair adjustment of rates by which the District will save this year, next year, and the year following at least \$20,000 annually, and after that, when they get the lamps readjusted according to the agreement, there will be an estimated saving of \$50,000 a year.

The next item is on page 10, and I will refer to this briefly. It is not so important in a way, and yet I want to call the attention of the committee to it. Under the present law the Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds is not allowed to sell anything except after advertisement and competitive bids. We have here in the District a good deal of property that, in the changes that are constantly going on, would be valuable to institutions that are supported in whole or in part by the District and the General Government, if it could be transferred to them. But the Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds is not allowed to do that. It so happens that when he advertises there are combinations against property almost as good as new whereby local competitors agree that they will not bid against each other, and as fine property and machinery as money can

buy has gone simply for old junk, and these institutions have had to go into the open market.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. May I inquire right there why it is being sold for old junk if it is as good as new? Why not continue the use of it?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I say, the price of old junk.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Why not continue the use of it?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. They have no use for it. I will cite, as an illustration, that in the establishment of the powerhouse down here it releases two boilers substantially as good as new. Now, under the law they will have to be advertised and sold for what they will bring. They are needed in one of our public institutions, and you will not get as much as the Government's half if you advertise them and sell them.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Why not transfer them?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. That is what this provides for, and it further requires a very careful accounting and report of everything that has been done by the Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. Chairman, I think we are ready to proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL EXPENSES.

Executive office: Two commissioners, at \$6,000 each; engineer commissioner, \$1,280 (to make salary \$6,000); additional compensation for 2 assistants to the engineer commissioner, detailed from the Engineer Corps of the United States Army, under act of Congress approved June 11, 1878, 2 at \$250 each; secretary, \$2,400; 2 assistant secretaries to commissioners, 1 at \$1,400, and 1 at \$1,200; clerk, \$1,600; clerk, \$1,500; clerk, \$1,300; 2 clerks, at \$1,200 each; clerk, who shall be a stenographer and typewriter, \$1,000; clerk, \$840; clerk, \$720; clerk, \$600; messenger, \$600; messenger, \$480; stenographer and typewriter, \$720; 2 drivers, at \$600 each.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. I observe there is an increase in the salaries of two of the commissioners up to \$6,000.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. That is correct.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. And down in line 16 an increase, as I understand, in the salary of one clerk—\$100.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Yes, sir.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. How about that clerk?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. That clerk is in the nature of a confidential clerk, to whom is intrusted papers for revision and preparation to be submitted. It is much more than an ordinary clerk in responsibilities.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Well, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the increase of salaries of the commissioners to \$6,000.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Will you reserve the point of order?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Yes; I will be glad to reserve the point of order.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House—I hope the gentleman from Illinois will hear me—when the organic act went into effect, which was 32 years ago, the commissioners were allowed \$5,000. That is a generation ago. The city then had only about 170,000 people; to-day it has nearly three times that many. The revenues of the District then were only about \$3,000,000; now they are over \$12,000,000. The salary was fixed then upon the basis or plane of the Congressman. Congressmen then received \$5,000. They now receive \$7,500. It is believed from experience, and I speak for myself, and gentlemen who know me know I do not live an extravagant life here, but I was never able to save anything from \$5,000 while attending the sessions of Congress in Washington, and yet my family have never been in society, in the common acceptance of that term. I had children here to support and educate, and it took everything of salary I got to do that while in the city. Now, the commissioners are in society. They can not help it, any more than the President can. They are the official representatives of the city, and to my certain knowledge it is costing some of them more than they receive, in current expenses, to creditably represent the office to which they have been appointed in the Capital of the Nation. We were urged by prominent citizens, representing the great interests of the city, to raise the salary to \$7,500 and restore the commissioners to where they were when the act went into effect. But your committee believed that \$6,000 would be a fair compensation at this time; and I do hope, in the light of this statement, that the gentleman from Illinois will withdraw his point of order and allow them to have this increase.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The present commissioners are practically new to the office, I believe, and at the time they were appointed

there was a very great demand on the part of many citizens to be appointed to the position, as I recall it. In the daily newspapers there was usually one new candidate every day, and sometimes two or three in one day. There was no lack of good material or of desire to hold the place.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. There is not a congressional district, nor has there been for 100 years, in the United States where there has not been a multiplicity of candidates for the office, although in the earlier days they knew it meant financial loss.

Mr. MANN. Now, as the gentleman well knows, if it is a financial loss there are other considerations that men take into account when they contemplate public positions.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Is not the servant worthy of his hire? Ought he not at least be allowed his fair current expenses for services rendered? I put that to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Of course that does not admit of controversy. That is the very question: What is a fair allowance?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I say, in view of my own experience in this city, that no man can live and be a commissioner of this District on \$5,000 a year and fairly represent the city and the public unless he draw on his private fortune or run in debt.

Mr. MANN. Yet the two men who were commissioners before, I presume, were quite willing to remain; or at least they did remain for a year and were more than willing to remain, and I do not think anybody ever heard that they incurred any great financial loss thereby.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Well, I would state that the committee was importuned to increase the salary of the former board of commissioners.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I wish they could find an officeholder once who would take the office—take it with the knowledge of what the salary was—and be willing to occupy it without constantly asking, as the gentleman from Michigan says these old and new commissioners have constantly asked, for increases in salary.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, just let me correct the impression, if such was made, that the present members of the board have constantly asked. They simply put the matter in the estimates.

Mr. MANN. Very well. That is what I object to, this constant importuning on the part of officials to receive a higher salary when they have taken the office knowing what the salary is. It is proper for us to fix a reasonable salary. In some cases we ought to raise it. I did not think that these present commissioners had been importuning.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. No; they have not.

Mr. MANN. Whether the old commissioners had been importuning or not I do not know.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I do not want to do an injustice to any gentleman. I do not mean that in an offensive sense, but they so presented it to the committee that we felt bound to take it into consideration, and I am told that there were no less than six citizens of Washington who refused to be considered as candidates for the position of commissioner on the ground that they could not afford it.

Mr. MANN. Very likely. There are a great many people who can not afford it, no matter what the salary is. I do not think that had anything to do with the refusal.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am always in accord with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois when he is right, and I find a great deal of pleasure in agreeing with him, because he usually is right. In conjunction with these commissioners, however, I would not have it go into the Record, and I know he does not want to create the impression that these commissioners were candidates for their present positions. I do not know in the entire country any three more unselfish or better qualified men for their particular duties than the gentlemen who hold these positions to-day. I do not know any three gentlemen who have attained their positions with the exercise of less political influence and with less demand or anxiety on their part to acquire them. I have some knowledge of the gentlemen, personally, socially, and politically, and so far as their politics are concerned, I will say that in their public service and their private life there has been probably less of partisanship in their make-up than I know of in any three other public men holding three positions of like character. I know, too, that it required considerable persuasion upon the part of the friends of some of these commissioners—and I know it was so especially in the case of Gen. Johnston—to induce them to accept the positions they now occupy, and I know that it was with a great deal of gratification upon the part of the people of this District and the people who were familiar with the qualifications of those

gentlemen that they were finally induced, at least one or two of them, to accept the tender of the position by the President of the United States, who had considerable personal knowledge of the abilities of one of them as displayed in public service in the past. So far as their salaries are concerned, I do not believe they are commensurate with their duties.

The peculiar manner in which the duties of administering the affairs of a great city center in them in the city of Washington does not pertain to the administration of the ordinary American municipality. It is true that the Congress of the United States does sit, as it were, as a city council, and that it enacts the laws, even down to details which I would regard in many cases as unnecessary, and if I had my way would wipe out many of the technical details of local administration that I regard as uselessly taking up the time of the House, and delegate that power to the Board of Commissioners or to some other body. But the fact that there are other departments in existence that have to do with the administration of the various divisions of municipal affairs in nearly all the other great American cities that are not in existence in the city of Washington imposes upon these gentlemen unusual burdens and responsibilities, and requires the exercise of more than ordinary skill on their part in the administration of the affairs of this great city. I believe there has been no criticism of them; but, on the other hand, there has been universal commendation on every hand since they assumed their offices, and that is the best evidence of the fact that they are worthy of their hire, and worthy not only of the \$5,000 they are now receiving, but, if I had my way, measuring their duties and measuring the compensation with reference to those duties, I would say that \$7,500 was a very moderate amount to be paid to them.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that neither one of these gentlemen were candidates for the office, but were chosen for their ability and integrity by a citizens' committee appointed by the citizens for that purpose, and that they were recommended to the President of the United States, and he appointed them on account of their great executive ability.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Yes; that is a fact.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if it is not true that all the commissioners are men of considerable wealth, and do not care much about the salary, but want the office for the dignity it confers upon time.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. No; that is hardly a fair impression to give as to their holding this office. It is true the gentlemen are men of considerable means, that they are not dependent on these positions for a livelihood in any sense. One of the gentlemen, Brig. Gen. John A. Johnston, resigned from the United States Army instead of becoming a retired officer, a man whose record as a military man and an executive officer is second to none of those who were in the service with him during the many years he reflected credit upon himself and honor upon his country by his splendid public record.

Mr. ROTHERMEL. I would like to ask my colleague if it is not a fact that the duties of the commissioners are increasing and multiplying all the time.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. That is a fact; the city is growing and developing, and the duty of officers charged with municipal affairs is keeping pace with the development of American life.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the gentleman from Missouri asked as to whether or not two of the members of this commission were not men of means. There is no question about that. I understand that both Commissioner Rudolph and Commissioner Johnston are fortunate enough to have accumulated some money, which ought not to be considered a discreditable proceeding, as it too often is in remarks on the floor of this House. These men were not candidates for this job. I know personally that their services were obtained after a great deal of work on the part of citizens of this District and against their natural inclination. They were governed entirely by their pride in the municipality when they yielded to the importunity.

But it is not a question of how much money these men have made for themselves; it is a question of paying them a salary commensurate with the services they are to perform. And they are performing splendid service. For instance, by the discovery of this lighting project they will have, if the matter goes through, saved the District on one item many thousands of dollars more than their entire annual salaries.

Now, we are overlooking one gentleman on that board, Maj. Judson, who is not a man of wealth. He is a Regular Army

officer of the Engineer Corps and has been detailed as an officer of the Army to be District Commissioner. His salary of \$5,000 as commissioner is only \$200 more than his major's pay, so that he is getting for his services as commissioner the sum of \$200—\$100 paid by the District of Columbia and \$100 by the Government of the United States.

I want to say to you that there may have been and have been good engineer commissioners in the past, but we have never had a more competent or a more thoroughly equipped engineer department in the District than we have under this same engineer commissioner. Now, he should be paid something near the salary of a colonel at least. For instance, we have the peculiar anomaly of having two junior major engineers serving in special capacities under the United States Government both of whom receive much larger salaries than does their senior ranking officer, Maj. Judson. One is the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds, which carries with it during his incumbency the rank and pay of a colonel, and he draws \$6,000.

The other is Maj. Cavanaugh, a still younger man on this special board to investigate the Gulf-to-Lake project in Chicago, and he draws \$2,000 a year more than does Maj. Judson. Both of these men are able and intelligent engineer officers, and neither have one-half the responsibility that does Engineer Commissioner Judson.

It was due to an earnest effort to bring this man's salary and the salary of his associates up toward a reasonable sum that we felt like coming before the House and changing the organic act which makes the salary of the commissioner \$5,000, which fixed that salary as far back as 1879, when the District was only composed of 177,000 people and the commissioners only disbursed of public money a little over \$3,000,000. To-day we have 343,000 people in the District, and the commissioners will expend by the end of this fiscal year \$13,000,000 of public money, and I want to say that they expend this honestly, and if the committee will indulge me I want to read one statement from the hearings which will justify my contention.

This is the statement of Mr. Shannon, one of the large speculative builders who appeared before the committee urging an increase to \$7,500, and I wish to say right here that none of the commissioners has ever made a statement to the committee asking to have his salary raised, nor did they ever appear before the committee, either personally or by proxy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. Mr. Shannon in his statement says:

But I want to tell you, gentlemen, something that will possibly surprise you, and also something which I know will make you feel good. I have had occasion recently to travel over the country and have visited many American cities, and in these cities it was perfectly natural for me to inquire about my own line of business, that of speculative building. In coming in contact with the speculative builders of other cities it was a revelation to me to find that graft in the large cities was systematized. There was a time when the speculative builder was held up right along the line, but he never knew how much to actually figure on a house, because he did not know how much he would be asked for graft. But to-day I can tell you that graft goes into his building expenses. These speculative builders know just how much it is to be before they start; it is practically the same in all cities. The \$4,000 house stands its penalty, the \$50,000 mansion stands its penalty, or the million-dollar hotel. Now, I want to impress upon you, gentlemen, the fact that I have built and sold over 800 houses in the city of Washington and I have never been asked for a cent of graft; it has never been intimated to me, either directly or indirectly, by any official in the Government, from the office boy to the highest official, that anything was expected of me. And when I told it to those who are in my line of business in other cities they marveled at it; they could hardly believe it—that that condition exists in this city. Now, if there is any one man who is held up it is the speculative builder; there is no man who wants more sewer extensions, street extensions, and things of that kind, than the speculative builder. I want you to know that I have been in business now going on 14 years, and in those 14 years I have come in contact with the commissioners and many of the men under them, and I have yet to meet a dishonest man in that building. This can readily be verified by any man in my line of business. These men, gentlemen, are worth money.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman comes from Columbus, Ohio.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. I do.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman inform us the salary paid by the city of Columbus, Ohio, to its mayor?

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. Five thousand dollars.

Mr. COX of Indiana. What is the population of that city?

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. One hundred and eighty-two thousand, in round numbers.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Does the gentleman know what is paid the mayor of the city of Cincinnati, the population of which is about 400,000?

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. I can not give you the salary of the mayor of Cincinnati. The mayor's salary in Columbus was

raised to \$5,000 about two years ago. Before that it was \$4,000, I believe.

Mr. KEIFER. The gentleman stated that the engineer commissioner gets \$200 more under the present salary than his major's pay?

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. KEIFER. I presume that pay is made up so that it reaches \$4,800 by his pay proper of \$3,000, and then longevity and quarters.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. I presume so.

Mr. KEIFER. That is what I wanted to know. How is he paid—as major of the Army?

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. Yes; he gets his regular pay and allowances and we make up the difference.

Mr. KEIFER. Then, as a matter of fact, the General Government—

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. Is paying him \$4,800 and the District government is only paying him about \$100 a year.

Mr. KEIFER. The General Government is paying \$4,900 and the District government about \$100.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. That is exactly it.

Mr. KEIFER. And the others are paid half and half.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. Half and half.

Mr. KEIFER. Why not let the District pay half of this in the same way?

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. I have not any objection to its paying half, but the law does not permit it.

Mr. KEIFER. I understand the law does not allow it so far as the officer is concerned.

Mr. MANN. That is the original organic act.

Mr. KEIFER. The organic act as to pay?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. One of the commissioners must be an engineer officer of the Army, and he is detailed by the War Department to do this work.

Mr. KEIFER. Why should not the District pay half the expense?

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. The framers of the organic act did not see fit to use such language, and that was passed in 1879. That is the only answer I can give.

Mr. KEIFER. I understand how that is done. The engineer officers on the Isthmus get their Army pay and then out of the fund which we appropriate the balance is made up.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. This is exactly the same way.

Mr. KEIFER. And here you make up the \$200.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman who made this point of order will withdraw it, simply in the interest of good government and clean administration, and because I know that he believes, as I believe and as the committee believes, that fair compensation should be paid for meritorious service.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not want any words that I said to appear as a reflection in any way upon the present commissioners. I do not know whether they sought the office or not, but I have heard before of men being in the hands of their friends. That is an old, old proposition. They accepted the offer. Maj. Johnston, undoubtedly, when he was with the War Department at the time of the Spanish War, was one of the ablest men connected with the department. Mr. Rudolph is one of the business men in the city of Washington. Maj. Judson is one of the best men in the Engineer Department of the Army, in my opinion, and is undoubtedly doing very able service. If I were fixing the salary for these men, I would have fixed it at \$7,500, but I do not see that they have any complaint if we do not do it. The excuse given, in the first instance, that these gentlemen are compelled to spend much money in social obligations probably is true, but is no reason why the salary should be increased. The salary is not high; I would not make the point of order upon it myself, but I would not be justified in criticizing my colleague because he made the point of order.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Illinois will make the point of order against the two commissioners other than the engineer commissioner, and I will state briefly why. Personally I believe that an official put in an executive position ought to enforce a statute whether he believes in it or not. Anyone who has looked into the question knows there is a division in the commission, and so far as assessment is concerned in this city the two civilian commissioners are in favor of putting a very low rate of assessment on the property of wealthy people who come here, while the engineer commissioner is in favor of carrying out the law and assessing as the law directs.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET of New York. I will.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. What is the source of the gentleman's information upon which he bases the assertion that the two civilian commissioners are in favor of assessing at a low rate the property of the wealthy people of this District?

Mr. BENNET of New York. If the gentleman will step to the telephone and call either Commissioner Rudolph or Commissioner Johnston he will tell you that is their theory.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. In that language, that they are in favor of assessing the wealthy people of the District at a lower rate—

Mr. BENNET of New York. They will say they are in favor of assessing at a lower rate the wealthy people who come here to make their homes here after having made their money elsewhere, and think that is good policy. It may be good policy, but the law is not that way, and until the law is changed so as the commissioners have the right to discriminate they ought not to discriminate, and I think the engineer commissioner is absolutely correct in his contention with his colleagues that the law ought to be enforced on the rich and the poor alike until Congress in its wisdom and discretion sees fit to confer discretion on the commissioners to differentiate between different classes of people; but so long as these particular commissioners continue that course it seems to me Congress ought not to reward them for an open and flagrant disregard of a duty by increasing their salaries.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand from the gentleman that the law now vests in the commissioners the discretion of the assessable rate on the property of the people living in the District?

Mr. BENNET of New York. It does not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then wherein does the argument of the gentleman apply, if they have no discretion?

Mr. BENNET of New York. The law is mandatory that the property in the District should be assessed equally, and I think it is 67 per cent of its market value.

Mr. STAFFORD. If they have no authority to disobey that law, wherein does the argument of the gentleman apply?

Mr. BENNET of New York. That makes it worse, that they have no discretion to disobey the law, but they do.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, I understand the gentleman to say that some of the commissioners are absolutely disobeying a mandate of the law as to the assessment of property.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Through their board of assessors and their assistant assessors.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, I think the gentleman presents a very serious case for consideration, if not by Congress by the executive branch, for the bringing of these commissioners, who are flagrantly violating the law in that particular, to book.

Mr. BENNET of New York. That may be; I am not denying that it is a serious case. It seems to me it is a serious case.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Do I understand the gentleman to say the present commissioners have adopted a classification that has reference to a man's wealth or the amount of property that he owns in this District?

Mr. BENNET of New York. They have adopted a policy based upon this discretion, that the ordinary person's property, the ordinary man, mechanic, or Government clerk, is assessed at 67 per cent of the property's market value; that if a man who has made a good deal of money in my city or in other cities comes here to this city—a most desirable place of residence as it is—and purchases a large tract of land and constructs a costly home, the idea is that the assessment of that building shall be at a less proportionate rate than on the home of the average citizen.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Let us be specific about this, because it is a very grave statement, as I regard it. Do you mean to say that the policy of the Board of Commissioners of the District is to apply one rate of assessment to a property of large proportions and dimensions and great original cost and another rate to a smaller property of less cost immediately adjacent?

Mr. BENNET of New York. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be continued for five minutes.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GARDNER] is recognized in his own time.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] has made the most serious charge that has been made against the District Commissioners during my membership in the House. If he is right, he ought to move their impeachment before we adjourn to-day. The gentleman need not smile. If there is anything in this world that honorable men appreciate

more than another it is integrity, and the integrity of two of the commissioners has been impeached by the gentleman from New York for violating openly, knowingly, and purposely the statutes of the Congress of the United States. Either by instruction or collusion, according to the gentleman, with the District assessors, they are making unwarranted and inexcusable discrimination between men of wealth and men of moderate means. I would like to know, and it is due to the House to know, the source of the gentleman's authority.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Chairman, I made my statement upon my responsibility as a Member, and I will say further that I have called the attention of the President of the United States, in writing, to a violation of the statute by these commissioners within the last six weeks. If the commissioners desired an investigation, the letter was referred to them. They have not as yet honored me, and, so far as I am informed, they have not as yet honored the President of the United States, with a reply. Having notified them in writing of an absolute breach of statute on their part, if they are the kind of men the gentleman says, let them ask the investigation at the hands of Congress.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Do I understand the gentleman to say the commissioners have put a rule in force, so far as the assessment of property is concerned, or is it simply in process of contemplation for the future?

Mr. BENNET of New York. My statement was that it was a policy now in force in this city.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the gentleman a question? I simply want to understand him. If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GARDNER] will permit, I would like to ask, if I understand, if the letter which the gentleman says he has addressed within six weeks to the President—

Mr. BENNET of New York. Well, a couple of months.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will not be technical about the time. I would like to ask if calling the attention of the President to a violation of duty on the part of the commissioners related to some other violation of duty, or to a specific violation of duty in this essential matter now under consideration.

Mr. BENNET of New York. It related to the appointment of an assessor in absolute violation of law.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does it refer to the appointment of an assessor or to the policy of assessing the property of wealthy people at a lower rate than the property of people of moderate means?

Mr. BENNET of New York. No; but having called their attention to one violation of the statute, in writing, I am not in any particular hurry to take up other accusations until they have paid some attention to that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The appointing of an assessor and the violating of a law in regard to assessments are very different things.

Mr. BOWERS. The assessments of property in the District are made by a board of assessors appointed by the commissioners.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOWERS. Will the gentleman indicate in what way it is, that being true, and the valuation of the property being fixed by these assessors and presumably independent of any action on the part of the commissioners, that the commissioners have been able to put into effect the policy that the gentleman has just mentioned?

Mr. BENNET of New York. Because they appoint assessors who have that same fixed idea, and that appointing of an assessor in violation of the law was what I called the attention of the President to in the letter which he referred to them.

Mr. ROTHERMEL. I desire to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] a question.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Certainly.

Mr. ROTHERMEL. Does the gentleman mean to convey to this House that this policy is fraudulently inaugurated, or that it is merely an error in judgment on the part of the commissioners?

Mr. BENNET of New York. I do not intend to characterize it. I said that the commissioners, in my judgment, ought to carry out the laws Congress enacted. If they believed the other policy was the better policy, even if they were right, they had no right to inaugurate it until Congress enacted a statute.

Mr. ROTHERMEL. Then the gentleman does not mean to convey the idea that it was fraudulently done?

Mr. BENNET of New York. It is not necessary for me to characterize.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. Do I understand the gentleman to make the charge that there was an illegality in the appointment of the assessors, or that the appointment was of a man who was unfit?

Mr. BENNET of New York. A man was appointed who was not qualified by the statute.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. In what way?

Mr. BENNET of New York. The gentleman is doubtless familiar with the statute prescribing the method of appointment of assessors in the District.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. I would like the gentleman to finish his answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio can be recognized.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. I will take the floor, and now yield sufficient time to the gentleman to finish his answer to the question.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Better finish the question.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. My question is, as I stated before, to determine whether or not this man did not come within the statutory qualification.

Mr. BENNET of New York. He did not come within the statutory qualification; I have not the statute before me or the letter.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. Do you mean to say they appointed a man not qualified under the statute. Who determined that? Yourself, or is that your private information, or did you have some opinion of the officer of the law?

Mr. BENNET of New York. There was no question when the facts were fresher in my mind than now. I wrote the letter to the President, and asked him in what way he had taken that action and appointed a man not qualified under the law. That letter was referred to the commissioners, and as yet I am without any reply.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. While the gentleman from New York is on the floor—

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan will be again recognized.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from New York stated that the facts involved in his statement could be ascertained and verified by communication with the commissioners. I regard him too highly to ever doubt him, but I did doubt the accuracy of the statement of his informant. I did as he suggested. I make this statement not for the purpose of criticizing the gentleman from New York, because I know he desires to be absolutely fair in this matter, as he is on all occasions, and I take it that he did not make the statement for the purpose of prejudicing this House. But upon inquiry the commissioners inform me that there is no difference of opinion whatsoever among them with reference to the method of assessing property in the District of Columbia. There is no division between Commissioner Judson on the one hand and Gen. Johnson and Mr. Rudolph on the other. There is no division of sentiment and no friction whatever. The assessors who make these assessments hold their positions for life. They are appointed for life; once appointed the commissioners exercise no control or influence over them whatsoever. Now, the appointments of the two assessors named by the present commissioners were made by their receiving promotions, having held subordinate positions in the office in which vacancies were created.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Will the gentleman yield just a moment? The gentleman seems to be somewhat familiar with the facts. Mr. Adams was appointed by promotion in the office. What was the business of the gentleman who was promoted and appointed prior to Mr. Adams?

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. I do not know what particular positions they occupied in the service. I simply make a statement covering the general proposition as to the policy of the present commissioners since entering upon the discharge of their duties.

I make this statement because of my regard for the gentleman from New York, and because the motives animating him are always fair, and because I know how loath he would be to do an injustice to anyone. I know he is fair, but in this case he is misinformed by some one.

Personally I know the gentlemen who occupy the three positions of Commissioners of the District, and I know no men who would hesitate longer to violate the statutes of this Nation than these three gentlemen; and because of the injustice that would be done them by the impression that creeps into the Record through the remarks of the gentleman from New York, I feel, in justice to the gentleman from New York, after bringing these facts to his knowledge, that he will do that which I believe he should do, and absolve these three commissioners from the suspicion and criticism which I believe in the heat of the moment and the hurry of debate he has cast upon them. They need no vindication from those who know them. Their

integrity and their devotion to their country have been proven too well in the past to permit a doubt to be raised regarding their conduct in this case. I hope the Record will not contain these uncorrected aspersions.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am quite calm. There is no "heat of the moment" as far as I am concerned. When these commissioners give a reply to the letter which I addressed to the President of the United States six weeks or two months ago, I will consider the rest of it.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, to clear the atmosphere a little, I would like to read from the law relative to the taxation of real estate and the appointment of the assessors. The duties are mandatory in this, that—

Hereafter all real estate in the District of Columbia subject to taxation, including improvements thereon, shall be assessed at not less than two-thirds of the true value thereof and shall be taxed $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent upon the assessed valuation thereof; and whenever a subdivision of any portion of said real estate is made and recorded with the surveyor of the said District, the board of assessors of the said District are hereby authorized and directed to reassess such property so subdivided, and the tax on said reassessment shall be due and payable at the semi-annual payment of taxes next following said assessment.

That is as to the duties.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. In just a moment. Now, as to the assessors, the law says:

The assessor of the District of Columbia and the members of said permanent board of assessors shall not be removed except for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

Thus removing them entirely from any influence that would prevent them from exercising their judgment as to what the property should be assessed at. The commissioners have no more right or power to influence or to deflect the judgment of these assessors than has the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman says the law prohibits the removal of the board of assessors or any member of the board except for malfeasance in office or other violation of the law, which it specifies. Does that place upon the commissioners the responsibility of ascertaining whether the board of assessors do violate the law?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. If the commissioners know that the law is violated—

Mr. MADDEN. Does that place the responsibility on the commissioners to ascertain whether the law is violated?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. If the commissioners have a suspicion that the law is being violated by the assessors, I would deem it their duty—I give simply my own judgment—to investigate the matter, and, if they found that their suspicions were true, to bring the necessary charges or have them removed from office.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know how true the statement is that I am going to make, as it comes to me from other sources; but the information comes to me that although the law provides that the assessments shall be made on the basis of two-thirds of the actual value, yet in the cases of many influential real estate owners in the District of Columbia the assessment is made as a matter of fact on less than 25 per cent of the actual value. Does the gentleman know whether that is true or not; and, if so, does he know whether the commissioners have ever investigated such a condition; and if they have not, why they have not?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. In the first place, I can not say that it is true, although I have heard rumors; but if a man listens to rumors, and brings onto the floor of this House reports impeaching the character of gentlemen, without knowledge, he does that which no gentleman would wish any other gentleman to do by him. It is too serious a matter.

Mr. MADDEN. Would the gentleman think this—

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Just a moment. I am not reflecting upon the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not say that you are. I am asking you if you think this would be proper—

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I have not finished my answer to your question yet.

Mr. MADDEN. All right.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I do know this, that the assessed valuation of much of the property in this city has been raised within the last year or two or three. As a consequence, the Government is paying more money this year on the half-and-half basis than it has ever paid before; not because of a change in the rate of assessment, as that is fixed by law, but the amount assessed against the property.

Mr. MADDEN. Regardless of that, would the gentleman, if he were a commissioner, consider it a part of his duty, if it

were bruited about so that everybody in the District knew that there was suspicion that assessments were not being levied equitably, but that rich and influential people were being relieved from the burden of taxation, while the ordinary property owner without influence was paying on the full value of his property, would he then, as commissioner, consider it a part of his duty to investigate and see whether or not these statements were true and whether the board of assessors were, as a matter of fact, performing their duty according to the strict letter of the law?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. That is a hypothetical case that is not possible of realization.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course the gentleman is not a commissioner, I realize.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Nor can he be.

Mr. MADDEN. Would it be a part of the duty of the men who are commissioners, in the opinion of the gentleman from Michigan, to make an investigation and ascertain if those were the real facts in the case?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. That is not the point in question at this time. I will reach that later. The point in question just now and the seriousness of the situation is that either the commissioners are in collusion with the assessors or have instructed them knowingly to violate the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks that the time of the gentleman from Michigan be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I think I have stated the case clearly in reply to the gentleman from Illinois. His supposition is not in court now. The thing that makes this a serious matter is, to repeat myself, that either by collusion with the commissioners or by instruction the assessors are violating the law knowingly and purposely. If that is the case, it is not for the commissioners to investigate; it is for the gentleman from New York either to make good or withdraw his insinuations.

Now, to come back to the other question. As I conceive it, to answer the gentleman's question, if the commissioners know, or have good reason to know, that the assessors are making favorites in the District by not assessing the rich proportionately with the poor; if they know it—not mere rumor, but rumors upon which they can base an investigation—it is their sworn duty to see that the assessors do their duty according to law or else remove them.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman let me submit this question: If it is common street rumor that certain property in the District is being assessed 25 per cent on its actual value while other property is being assessed on the basis of two-thirds of its actual value, would not the gentleman think it was the duty of the commissioners to investigate the specific case in which such a condition existed?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. If they knew of it.

Mr. MADDEN. If they hear of it.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. No; the commissioners would not have time for anything else if they took note of all the rumors on the street. Neither would the gentleman from Illinois do it in his business. I venture to say that the gentleman from Illinois can not find a city one-half the size of Washington where there are not discriminations. I am not justifying it, but in cities where the very thing he alleges takes place here takes place.

Mr. MADDEN. It may be true that that is the case; but, nevertheless, that does not justify it here. I think it is well understood by almost everybody in the District. I do not claim that it is the duty of the gentleman from Michigan to run down all these rumors. I do not claim it is his duty to be positive as to whether discrimination exists or not; I do not claim that he should attempt to control the attitude of the commissioners. I do not claim that he ought to know whether there is discrimination or not, but I do claim that if there is discrimination, and it is common knowledge on the street, that that knowledge ought to reach the ears of the commissioners, and if it can not reach them in any other way, I think it is the duty of the Members of this House to state the facts as they understand them, so that the commissioners may be put on notice, and after they are put on notice let us see whether they take such notice of the information given them from the floor of the House as to compel them to discharge one of the most responsible duties that devolves upon them by virtue of the office they hold.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is admitted that there has been some criticism in the past with reference to the method of the assessors.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania admit that the criticism is justified?

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. On the part of the present commissioners, it is absolutely not justified.

Mr. MADDEN. I am not talking about the present commissioners.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. The proposition before us now is whether or not the duties of the present commissioners have been efficiently and properly performed, and in answer to the gentleman's question as to what the commissioners ought to do, first let me answer as to whether the Congress and the public ought to notify them of these abuses. Possibly they should, and possibly that has been done. But whether it has or not the commissioners have already acted, and they have notified the present assessors that there are some words in the present law that apparently have been overlooked, and those words are "not less than." Under the old method of assessment assessors enforced the two-thirds rule rigidly. In adhering to that strict line they have possibly, as they do in all cities, fallen a little below and sometimes a little above in their attempts to adhere to that line.

The commissioners have called attention to the fact that the words "not less than" exist in the law, and therefore they may go even above the two-thirds line rule and impose a greater burden by way of taxation upon the property of this District than they have imposed heretofore. As a consequence of that policy suggested by those commissioners the estimated revenues of the District during the present year have increased from \$6,337,000 to \$7,095,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Now that the gentleman is in close communication with the commissioners and seems to be advised of what they have done and are going to do, can he tell me whether the instructions which they gave to the board of assessors to the effect that the assessment must be made at not less than two-thirds has been applied to the great owners of real estate, who have influence through which many of the commissioners secure their appointments?

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Well, I will say this in reply to the gentleman, that in the line of the doctrine of equity I presume that to have been done which ought to have been done. I presume the directions of the District Commissioners have been complied with, and if I had no other knowledge of the subject the official figures will bear me out, inasmuch as there has been an increase of nearly \$1,000,000 this year in District revenues.

Mr. MADDEN. I could cite them to a few buildings that I would like to have them investigate.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman speaks of an increased valuation of \$1,000,000 in one year. That is nothing more than would be normal.

Mr. BOWERS. Increased taxation, not valuation.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania said valuation, as I understood him.

Mr. NORRIS. That increased taxation comes about entirely through increase of valuation, does it not? As I understand, the rate is just the same?

Mr. BOWERS. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Then the increased taxation means increased valuation.

Mr. SIMS. I want to ask the gentleman from Michigan this: Is it not a fact that in this District no intangible personal property, such as stocks, bonds, and moneys, are taxed at all?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. That is the law.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. Certainly, that is the law.

Mr. SIMS. Does it not necessarily put a greater tax burden upon real estate than it would if all property, intangible personalty as well as other property, was taxed?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Not if the rate of taxation is the same, because that would be levied then, even though the bonds and moneys were taxed.

Mr. SIMS. You have to get a certain amount of money from the District every year by taxation, and if you tax only one species of property to get that total sum does it not necessarily follow that that species of property must be taxed higher than it otherwise would?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. As I understand it, there is no limit fixed upon the amount that must be raised. The law determines the rate of taxation. The assessors determine the amount against each specific piece of property. The returns from the assessment give the revenues of the District, together with certain other assessments and the Government supplementing that by a like sum from the National Treasury.

Mr. SIMS. I want to put it this way: If the intangible personal property was taxed like real estate, would not it relieve to some extent the burden of taxation upon the owners of homes here and reduce the cost of living to that extent?

Mr. MANN. Not a dollar.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. It might and it might not.

Mr. SIMS. Is it not a fact that people with large intangible wealth, such as stocks and bonds, are induced to come here and spend the results of the fortune they have accumulated in the States, thereby dodging the tax on personal property in the States? I would ask if that is not held out as an inducement for that kind of people to move to and stay in this District.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I will say that that is not germane to the question under discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object to the gentleman having five minutes more, but after that has expired I shall object to any further discussion on this subject that does not require a motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. As I was saying, the question of the gentleman from Tennessee is not germane to the question before the House—

Mr. SIMS. I am not talking about the commissioners.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. But as a general proposition there is truth in what he says; but the law is as it is, and until changed we have no alternative but to follow it.

Mr. SIMS. What I want to do is to see why Congress does not tax intangible personal property in this city. Why are we afraid to do so?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I now call for a vote upon the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is made by the gentleman from Illinois and is still pending. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of order?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it occurred to me that in this city of Washington there are a great number of important and unusual conditions existing. I believe in paying men for what they do. I do not believe in underpaying any man for his services. Since I have been a Member of this House I have observed somewhat the conditions that have existed in the city of Washington, and it occurs to me that to-day they are even worse than they were one, two, or five years ago. Until the present commissioners can offer or show that they have produced a better condition of affairs in this city, I do not believe it is incumbent upon us to increase their salaries. I believe that we should have from the office of the commissioners more devotion to duty and less social duty. I believe that we should have less gold braid and shoulder straps and more work.

Mr. MANN. Certainly nobody will make that accusation against Mr. Judson, because, if there is anyone who hates gold braid and shoulder straps, it is that gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. It has been claimed, I will say to my colleague from Illinois, and stated here this morning, that one reason why we should increase these salaries is on account of the social duties of these commissioners and that is the reason I mention that. I do not believe in depriving men of their social duties. I do not believe in taking men and placing them in positions against their will, but I do believe that the President can find three commissioners, and I am not saying a word against these men, I do not know them personally, and they may in 12 months' time show that their services have been of great worth to this city, but until that time comes I shall insist upon the point of order, as stated to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order. Does the gentleman from Michigan wish to be heard upon it?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I do not defend it; it is purely out of order, but it is simply a question of equity and right, in the judgment of the committee.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I will state the gentleman from Michigan might have some difficulty in proving what he stated—that it is a matter of right to commissioners, especially in view of the statements made upon the floor of the House by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET].

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MANN. It went out on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move the rate be fixed at \$5,000 for the ensuing year to the two civilian commissioners and \$280 to the gentleman whom I never saw.

in shoulder straps or gold braid. He has always been too busy to talk of any military matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Before the word "thousand," in line 4, insert the word "five," so as to read "\$5,000;" and insert before the parentheses, in line 6, "\$280;" and in line 6, before the word "thousand," insert "five."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchasing division: Purchasing officer, who shall, under the direction of the commissioners, supervise the purchase and distribution of all supplies, stores, and construction materials for the use of the government of the District of Columbia, and who shall give bond in such sum as the commissioners may determine, \$2,500; deputy purchasing officer, \$1,600; clerk, \$1,500; 7 clerks, at \$1,200 each; 3 clerks, at \$900 each; 3 clerks, at \$720 each; 3 clerks, at \$600 each; inspector of fuel, \$1,500; assistant inspector of fuel, \$1,100; storekeeper, \$900; messenger, \$600; driver, \$480; inspector, \$900; inspector, \$780; 2 laborers, at \$600 each; inspector of property, \$936; 2 property-yard keepers, at \$1,000 each; inspector of materials, \$1,200.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee the cause of this new organization, which requires so many additional places.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would say that it simply changes the name of "property clerk" to "purchasing officer." A confusion arises now when people go in there, because they do not know to which office to go.

Mr. MADDEN. And then there are no changes at all in this?

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. None whatever.

Mr. MADDEN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of obtaining some information. I notice the committee has vested some new authority in this purchasing officer as to the purchase of supplies. Personally I think it is a very commendable provision to center authority in one officer to purchase supplies. I would like to inquire, if the gentleman has the information, as to the extent of the supplies that are purchased by this officer.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. In round numbers, \$1,000,000—in excess rather than below that amount.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the provision, he is to have absolute supervision of the contracting and the purchase of supplies to that amount.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. The custody and distribution of them.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the committee considered whether the salary of \$2,500 is commensurate for a position of that responsibility, wherein the officer has the purchasing of over a million dollars' worth of supplies? In the postal service, where the purchasing agent merely has a supervisory authority over contracts for purchases, the salary is \$4,000. Here is an officer vested with very responsible powers, and I think the salary of \$2,500 is a very low one to be paid a man who has the absolute purchase of a million dollars' worth of supplies each year.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would say in reply to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the commissioners recognize the worth of the man and the responsibilities of the position, and did recommend that his salary be increased to \$3,000, but, pursuing the general policy of economy, the committee did not grant the request.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase and maintenance of one motor vehicle for the official use only of the employees of the building department in inspection work, or so much thereof as may be necessary, \$1,500.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I would like to inquire of the gentleman in charge of the bill the necessity for the purchase of this automobile.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. It is to facilitate these inspectors' getting about the city. I would say to the gentleman from Indiana that it is a choice between adding an additional inspector or rendering means by which the present inspectors can get more rapidly from place to place, and we believe it is in the interest of economy and good administration.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Does the bill anywhere in it contain any item for the maintenance of the automobile after purchase?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. This is not an automobile.

Mr. COX of Indiana. What is it?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. It is a motor vehicle.

Mr. COX of Indiana. What is the difference? It will be used to transfer these employees over the city from place to place, will it not?

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask a question there? Would it be possible for more than one of

the inspectors to be taken in the vehicle at any one time, and if more than one were taken, would it not be sending more men than needed for any one inspection? Buildings are inspected by one man, not by 10 or 15 men. The purchase of an automobile for building inspectors is absurd. Each building inspector is supposed to have a district over which he has jurisdiction. The buildings being constructed in that district are inspected by that man, and he is supposed to walk from one building to another, to climb the building, and see that the character of the material that is supposed to go into it does go into it; that the character of the construction is complied with; that the sanitary conditions are being carried out; that the plumbing is put in as it ought to be put in, and that no sewer gas is allowed to escape by reason of bad plumbing. And the mere transfer of inspectors from one place to another is an absurdity, and the motor vehicle is not needed for any such purpose, in my judgment.

Mr. COX of Indiana. There is now law for it.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I will say that they not only have a building inspector, but plumbing inspectors, and other inspectors, on all this kind of work. They have a motor vehicle for the engineer commissioner. The engineer commissioner may use it for half a day. They have it arranged in that shape. The assistant engineers use it for another half a day. They keep that vehicle going all the time in order to do the work of the engineer department, and I assume the same method will be followed in the use of the vehicle for inspectors.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Let me ask the gentleman this question, after listening to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois: The city is divided into inspection districts?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I think so.

Mr. COX of Indiana. How many inspectors are there?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. They go anywhere where they are called for.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I see no real benefit an automobile would be to these inspectors who are assigned to a special district. I make the point of order.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. They are not assigned, I will say to the gentleman from Indiana, to any special district.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Is there any law for it?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. There are 23 of these inspectors.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan know any law on the subject?

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this is subject to the point of order. We have by law created a building inspecting department, and the necessary incidental machinery to operate that department is carried along with that authorization. This motor vehicle is as necessary for that department as stationary or other instruments they may use in their inspection; just the same as having horses and wagons, and therefore it is authorized by law.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The law of which the gentleman speaks, does that make any provision whatever for the conveyance of inspectors in a wagon, bicycle, or otherwise?

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. It provides that there shall be an inspection department, which shall do certain work. That carries inferentially all the necessary incidentals to carry on and conduct that work.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that in the very next item we have elevator inspectors and a provision for maintenance of two motor cycles, for use in their inspection of elevators in the District of Columbia, at \$15 a month.

Mr. COX of Indiana. But that does not meet my inquiry. The law upon which you say this proposition is based, does that provide for the conveyance of inspectors throughout the city here in any way, by horses, vehicles, bicycles, or otherwise?

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. It does not express, I suppose, in specific language that the inspectors shall be hauled to and from their work; but it does provide for an inspection; and that carries with it anything necessarily incidental to the work. If they have to go around this District, 10 miles long by 7 wide, it is a necessity of the department, and necessary to carry out the functions of that department, to have an automobile as a part of the means for performing their duty.

Mr. MANN. I want to make a suggestion to my friend from Indiana. I do not know whether it will control the Chair. The other day, during consideration of the Army appropriation bill, the Chair ruled that it was in order to make provision for the maintenance and purchase of horses, wagons, and other vehicles; the "other vehicles" at that time being intended to cover automobiles, as a means of carrying on the work.

Mr. COX of Indiana. A work already in progress.

Mr. MANN. The Army is no more a work in progress than inspecting buildings, so far as that is concerned. I was a little doubtful about the ruling the other day, although I made an argument in favor of it.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I think myself the gentleman was a little doubtful of the ruling of the Chair on that same point. Mr. Chairman, as yet I have listened very attentively for gentlemen in charge of the bill to cite any general law under which they found a basis for this provision. I have not read the statute. As they have read it to the committee, in my judgment there is no law whatever on which this item can possibly be based. If there were anything whatever in the statute giving Congress the power to appropriate money to convey inspectors from one inspection district to another in the city of Washington by horse, carriage, vehicle, motor cycle, or any other way, there might be and would be a way to bring around that it might be a law on which to hang this item. But I take it that, in the absence of those things in the statute, there is no law for it and that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, one word. The affairs of the District are divided up into bureaus and sub-bureaus for the purposes of good administration. The gentleman says there is no law for this. The law provides that inspection shall be made of new buildings in the plumbing department, sanitary department, by the building inspector, elevator inspector, and so forth. The city has grown to that size where there must be some latitude of administration. I would say to the gentleman from Indiana that if you undertake to tie the hands of these officials by statute in everything the trouble will be interminable. There is no statutory law for furnishing a carriage to the commissioners, or an automobile; and yet if the gentleman had been with the subcommittee a few days ago he would have concurred in the opinion of the committee, as expressed over and over again, that simply as a time saver to the engineer department it was worth more than its cost, and hence is a matter of economy. I say to the gentleman that it is a question of good administration, and we must either furnish better conveyances or more men.

Mr. COX of Indiana. With all due deference to the gentleman in charge of the bill, I have heard that statement made on the floor of this House time and time again, that this is in the interest of a saving of time and in the interest of economy. Yet we see the appropriations in this bill mount up every year. I do not take very kindly to the argument that this is in the interest of time, that it is in the interest of economy. Otherwise it looks to me as though these appropriations would not mount automatically year in and year out.

I listened with much interest to the gentleman from Kentucky who discussed the enormous increase of appropriations, and in whose judgment, and in mine, too, the number of useless employees here in the District of Columbia. I think of all the useless things that there are tied on to the District of Columbia are these automobiles, and I insist on my point of order, unless there is a statute authorizing them.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I hope the gentleman will let this go over and go around and make a personal investigation, and then he will change his mind.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I have such a prejudice against automobiles that I would refuse to ride in one or go around and investigate it.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The engineer officer of the District has got to look after various works of public improvement in various parts of the city, and anything that will get him from one part of the city to another in the least time is in the interest of economy.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I listened to the gentleman's argument in advocacy of the item in his bill—

Mr. HULL of Iowa. This is fully as important as the provisions in the military bill.

Mr. COX of Indiana. But I rather thought at the time, or I drew the inference from his statement, that he himself did not believe that there was any law in force that justified the purchase and maintenance of automobiles for the Army.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. There was authorization for other vehicles, because the organic act creating the department provided for any appropriation necessary to carry it on. But I do think in this case that if my friend from Indiana will make a personal investigation of the great saving of time in an automobile over a horse and carriage—and we are bound to furnish one or the other—he will see that one man can do more supervisory work, in the way of keeping in close touch with public works, with one automobile than he could with five carriages.

Mr. CARLIN. Provided he can keep the automobile going.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. They can keep it going, and in my judgment, as the world progresses in means of locomotion, in

economies of time this country ought to keep up with the progress of the world and use time-saving appliances.

Mr. COX of Indiana. That may be true, but I object to keeping up with the progress of the world at the expense of the people in buying automobiles for public officials.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I do not understand that they do. They are not bought for the officials, but for the public service.

Mr. BENNET of New York. As the chairman who made the ruling on the Army bill, which has been alluded to, I desire to say that I had then, and have now, no doubt whatever as to the accuracy of the ruling. The argument proceeded upon the concession that the transportation of the Army was an object authorized by statute, and therefore the question before the House was the method of transportation.

It was provided in the bill—as the bill read at the time the question came before the Chair—that carriages, wagons, and carts might be purchased and maintained, and it seemed to the then occupant of the chair that when there was a statute in the beginning that authorized the transportation of the Army, and that from time to time the agencies had grown up, that when we had expanded climatically at least from the time when there was nothing but wagons to the time when we reached so far as temperature was concerned—

From Greenland's icy mountains,
From India's coral strand,
Where Africa's sunny fountains
Roll down their golden sands.

[Applause.]

I am glad that gentlemen recognize the quotation. [Laughter.]

It seemed to the Chair that we had a perfect right to expand the methods of transportation with the expansion of territory over which we had to transport our armies. Accordingly, it seemed to the Chair that the question of automobiles not being involved in the ruling that where they mention carts, horses, carriages, and everything that they had a perfect right to add for fear that they had missed a sled in Alaska or a canoe in the Philippines, the words "other vehicles," and the Chair said at that time that the question would first arise with the disbursing officer whether we ought to buy it; and, second, whether it was appropriated for.

Mr. MANN. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from New York that it is a grave mistake for any chairman to come on the floor and defend his ruling. The ruling went without question and stands.

Mr. BENNET of New York. And will stand.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BENNET of New York. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOULDEN. I would like to ask how these inspectors now get around and perform their work.

Mr. BENNET of New York. I am not interested in that particular question; I was more interested in the doubt that was cast on the ruling.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I will answer the gentleman from New York. They use a team now, and some use motor vehicles.

Mr. GOULDEN. There is a team owned by the department, and the inspectors use it?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The gentleman from Indiana seems to think that they are furnishing these automobiles to all the officers.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. They are furnishing very few, indeed.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Yes; but they creep in one by one, and at the rate they are being bought they will all have them soon.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TILSON). The question presented to the Chair is not as to which is the most economical way for inspectors to travel from one point to another in the discharge of their duty. The question to be decided by the Chair is whether the point of order made against the paragraph is well taken; that is, whether it is in order to appropriate here for a motor vehicle. The ruling on a somewhat similar point, when the Army appropriation bill was under consideration, has been referred to, and in the opinion of the Chair has been very clearly distinguished from the present case by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET], who made that ruling.

Transportation for the Army has been appropriated for many years and is conceded a necessary part of the appropriations for the Army. The item at that time objected to was simply an addition to the usual means of transportation. In the present case it does not appear that there has ever been transportation provided for by law or by specific appropriation, and it does not appear from the language of the bill itself that

there is any necessity for inspectors traveling from one place to another, though this is not a matter within the province of the Chair. As it has never been appropriated for before, it seems to the Chair that whether it is an automobile or a horse and wagon, unless some law authorizing it can be cited it is not in order on this appropriation bill, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, on page 110 of the bill, section 3, the Chair will find a general provision which runs in every appropriation bill, which seems to carry with it the general authority to provide proper conveyance for all the departments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not informed whether that is existing law.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. It is existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair called on any gentleman who could do so to cite existing law as an authority for the appropriation.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. That is true; but I just this moment had this particular provision called to my attention. I called it to the attention of the Chair as soon as I discovered it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already ruled and sustained the point of order. The Clerk will read.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. GAINES having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On January 16, 1911:
H. R. 26583. An act to authorize the city of Drayton, N. Dak., to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North.
On January 17, 1911:
H. R. 971. An act for the relief of Joseph R. Reichardt.
On January 18, 1911:
H. R. 18960. An act for the relief of Emanuel Sassaman; and
H. R. 22829. An act for the relief of George W. Nixon.
On January 19, 1911:
H. R. 24291. An act for the relief of Cooper Walker.
On January 20, 1911:
H. R. 23081. An act for the relief of the family of Samuele Badolato.
On January 23, 1911:
H. R. 18540. An act for the relief of John H. Willis.
On January 24, 1911:
H. R. 20132. An act for the relief of Emil Haberer.
On January 26, 1911:
H. R. 25057. An act for the relief of Willard Call and John M. Wyatt.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

To reimburse two elevator inspectors for the provision and maintenance by themselves of two motor cycles for use in their official inspection of elevators in the District of Columbia, \$15 per month each, \$360.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the item.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, to be consistent there is nothing else to do than to make the point of order, and yet you take from these men the very thing that adds every day to their value many times more than they cost. They furnish these themselves, and all they want is simply pay for the upkeep.

Mr. COX of Indiana. What is meant by the language to reimburse? That to me would mean to pay them for some money they had expended out of their own pockets.

Mr. MANN. Oh, that is for next year.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. But it is right in line with the gentleman's other objection, and to be consistent he must adhere to this.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, there is this difference: It is merely to reimburse these men for the care and keep of motor cycles which they own, whereas the other was for the purchase and maintenance of motor-cycle vehicles to be owned by the Government.

Now, I can readily understand where gentlemen might wish to make a distinction in making the point of order against an automobile to be owned by the Government and an item which carries an amount merely to reimburse a man for maintaining it himself. This is similar to the practice in the postal service for reimbursing certain letter carriers who own automobiles an

amount for expenses of maintenance, and the amount granted them is much higher than the amount granted here.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. This is a motor cycle.

Mr. STAFFORD. Fifteen dollars a month for the upkeep and the wear and tear of a motor cycle to me would not seem to be a very large amount.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Can the gentleman from Wisconsin tell us anything about what it costs to keep these machines up?

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not.

Mr. COX of Indiana. What do they cost, in the first instance, when new?

Mr. STAFFORD. The cost of a new motor cycle is something in the neighborhood of \$250 or more.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Is not this true, that they can be bought from \$150 to \$200?

Mr. STAFFORD. When I was last informed about the cost, these motor cycles, the good ones, could not be purchased for less than \$250.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I take it the average life of one of them is four or five years, and here we are appropriating \$180 to keep one for a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. That will include the cost of gasoline, which is considerable, and the wear and tear and the replacement of parts; and \$15 a month, I think, is not exorbitant for the upkeep of one of these motor cycles.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Can the gentleman inform the committee of any private business that takes care of the expense of private conveyances of its employees—for keeping them up?

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, I know that many of these motor cycles are being used by private establishments in the city of Washington, and I have always believed they should be extended to the postal service, because my personal opinion is it is one of the most economical means of conveyance that can be devised. As has been pointed out by the chairman of the committee, here is a means of rapidly transferring these men about the city, and very few cities are so well adapted by reason of the asphalt streets for quick transfer as the city of Washington.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. COX of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Can anyone give any reason why these elevator inspectors need to be transferred so rapidly about the city? Elevator inspection is not done in a moment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would rather have them transferred rapidly about the city than by the slow process of walking.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I suppose the gentleman walks both to and from the Capitol.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is for hygienic purposes.

Mr. MANN. The street car runs wherever they are building elevators, and there is no occasion for an elevator inspector to go from, say, Georgetown away over into the east end of the District in one day. Why should he?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not acquainted with the duties of these officials.

Mr. MANN. Their duties are to inspect elevators, I suppose.

Mr. STAFFORD. They can be transported by this means much more quickly than by street cars.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is unable to distinguish between a four-wheel vehicle and a two-wheel vehicle, and therefore sustains the point of order.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. KNOWLAND having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 10327. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 10326. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; and

S. 10318. An act authorizing the Commissioner of the General Land Office to grant further extensions of time within which to make proof on desert-land entries.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 28406. An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for ful-

filling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Plumbing inspection division: Inspector of plumbing, \$2,000; principal assistant inspector of plumbing, \$1,400; 5 assistant inspectors of plumbing, 1 at \$1,200 and 4 at \$1,000 each; clerk, \$1,200; temporary employment of additional assistant inspectors of plumbing and laborers for such time as their services may be necessary, \$2,200; draftsman, \$1,350; sewer tapper, \$1,000; clerk, \$900; 3 members of the plumbing board, at \$300 each; maintenance of motor cycle, \$120.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph, and particularly that part "for maintenance of motor cycle, \$120." I make the point of order on it in the interest of time.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in this case the Government owns the motor cycle, and it is the maintenance that costs and—

Mr. COX of Indiana. How long has the Government owned it?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I can not say.

Mr. COX of Indiana. What was the cost in the first instance?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Three hundred dollars for purchase and maintenance.

Mr. COX of Indiana. What can the gentleman say as to how much it does cost to maintain one of these motor cycles per annum? It looks to me like \$10 a month is a tremendous amount.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I presume the cost of maintenance all depends upon the use of it.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Probably that is true; but did the gentleman have any evidence before his committee as to what it costs?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It costs a great deal for gasoline. They do not run them by footwork anymore.

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to ask of my friend what his estimate would be for the oil.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Repairs and oil are estimated at \$10 a month.

Mr. BUTLER. That is a pretty high estimate for a motor cycle.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The question I asked the gentleman is this: If the gentleman has any evidence or took any in the hearings before his committee as to what it did cost to maintain this motor cycle?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I do not remember at this time.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Does the gentleman believe it costs \$10 a month?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I would say to the gentleman from Indiana that with many things in this bill and in other bills we have to take the judgment of the men on whom we can rely. We can not go specifically into everything and inquire into every detail.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I have no doubt but what the statement is true; but who recommended to the gentleman that it would cost \$10 per month?

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. I would like to explain, with the permission of the chairman, that this item only calls for \$10 per month. It is one that might be termed high, but when you come to think the tires on a motor cycle, with the present price of tires, cost considerable more money than those of a bicycle; and if it had a puncture or a blow-out, as they call it, one tire would use up your \$10 or more if one tire blew out in any one month. Now, they have to have gasoline; and that averages 18 or 20 cents for the proper grade of gasoline; it varies somewhat. Then the repairs on any motor-driven vehicle are very heavy on account of the extreme rapidity with which the engine and the machinery work. I have had some experience—not with motor cycles, but in a business where they employ gasoline cars—and I know something about the cost of repairs upon cars and motor cycles, and I am satisfied the estimate is not high, not in any sense of the word. It might not in one month run as high as \$10 and the next month it might run to \$30 or \$40, and consequently you have to make a general average of 12 months for the year, and I do not think that at that amount you would more than get out; I am not sure they would.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Is this item carried in last year's appropriation bill?

Mr. MANN. We carried last year \$300 for the purchase and maintenance of this motor cycle.

Mr. COX of Indiana. It may be necessary, Mr. Chairman, that that item should remain in there, and therefore I will withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Care of District Building: Clerk and stenographer, \$1,800; chief engineer, \$1,400; 3 assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each; electrician, \$1,200; 2 dynamo tenders, at \$875 each; 3 firemen, at \$720 each; 3 coal passers, at \$600 each; electrician's helper, \$840; 8 elevator conductors, at \$600 each; 2 laborers, at \$660 each; 2 laborers, at \$500 each; 2 chief cleaners who shall also have charge of the lavatories, at \$500 each; 40 cleaners, at \$240 each; chief watchman, \$1,000; assistant chief watchman, \$660; 8 watchmen, at \$600 each; pneumatic-tube operator, \$600; in all, \$38,730: *Provided*, That the employees herein authorized for the care of the District Building shall be appointed by the assistants to the engineer commissioner, with the approval of the commissioners.

For fuel, light, power, repairs, laundry, mechanics, and labor not to exceed \$3,500, and miscellaneous supplies, \$25,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move at the end of line 17 to strike out the word "eight," leaving it "\$30,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 17, change "twenty-eight" to "thirty."

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that until the gentleman in charge of the bill can look at it. It has been passed. We have read all of that page. If the gentleman in charge of the bill has no objection, I will withdraw mine, but I raise the point of order now that it is not in order to go back to that amendment without unanimous consent.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I renew the point of order made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL]. Mr. Chairman, this is already current law.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] on his feet asking for recognition before the paragraph was completed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes; I was.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa reserves a point of order against the amendment which the Clerk will report.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. My point of order, Mr. Chairman, was that we had passed that paragraph and the following paragraph also. Therefore an amendment to a paragraph that has been passed over is not in order except by unanimous consent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It is all one paragraph, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I beg your pardon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The paragraph is "Care of District Building."

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The paragraph that I call attention to and that the gentleman wants to amend ends on line 22. We have read the paragraph that ends on line 25 and commenced to read the paragraph at the top of page 7.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] if he was on his feet seeking recognition at the time the paragraph he seeks to amend was passed? If so, the Chair will recognize the gentleman for an amendment. Otherwise, unless by unanimous consent, we can not return to it. Was the gentleman from Kentucky on his feet seeking recognition, and failed to receive it, at the time the paragraph he proceeded to amend was passed and the one following it read?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I was on my feet, Mr. Chairman, with the intention of asking for recognition when the reading clerk read the last word of line 22, and as he went into line 23 I took it for granted that that was still the one paragraph relating to the one subject, and it was there that I asked for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman was on his feet seeking recognition at the time the Clerk finished reading line 22 the amendment is in order. Otherwise, not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I most certainly was, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 17, strike out "thirty-eight" and insert "thirty," so that it will read, "\$30,730."

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, that "thirty-eight" is simply a total of specific offices and salaries attached thereto in the preceding part of the paragraph. The gentleman might just as well make it 20, or 10, or 5. It would be in just as much order. The parties are named, the salaries are fixed, and the money must be provided.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, if the amount of money is limited, then the commissioners can not go beyond that amount and they will reduce the number of employees.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman does not mean to contend for one moment that if we appro-

priate specifically to various positions and designate the salary, by striking out the phrase "in all, \$38,730," that would affect at all the salaries that have been voted or granted to these respective officials before, and—

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It would limit the appropriation to them; and if I had time to pick out the number of employees that would amount to that sum I would ask to change the amendment and ask for their elimination.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. Does not the gentleman know that there is a statute which provides that where the items are specifically appropriated for they shall govern, and not the sum total?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. There would be no appropriation to pay them, and therefore the commissioner would not employ them.

Mr. BOWERS. Let me suggest the condition the clause would be left in if the amendment carried. It would be contradictory in terms. The first portion of the paragraph would carry its specific appropriation in the amount named, which, as a matter of fact, would be \$38,000, and the gentleman from Ohio is correct in his statement that nothing would be accomplished even if the amendment was voted. The amount appropriated consists of the total of the individual appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For temporary clerk hire for preparing numerical books, to be immediately available, provided that the regular employees of the assessor's office may be employed on this work after office hours, with additional compensation to be determined by the commissioners upon the recommendation of the assessor, \$2,000.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I reserve the point of order on that. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill whether or not the regular assessor's force is not sufficiently large to do this work contemplated in the paragraph under consideration.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. It is represented that it is not. They sometimes have to employ the help outside of other clerks.

Mr. BOWERS. If the gentleman will permit me, I will read to the gentleman from Indiana from the hearings:

Mr. RUDOLPH: The triennial assessment is to be made next year, and they require extra help. Three years ago you added this provision for temporary clerk hire.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Then this item is only temporary?

Mr. BOWERS. Every three years.

Mr. MANN. We carried it before.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Then it is carried once every three years. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of corporation counsel: Corporation counsel, \$4,500; first assistant, \$2,500; second assistant, \$1,800; third assistant, \$1,600; fourth assistant, \$1,500; fifth assistant, \$1,500; stenographer, \$1,200; clerk, \$720; in all, \$15,320.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on that paragraph. I would like to inquire the necessity of adding a fifth assistant attorney to the corporation counsel.

Mr. MANN. That is the natural growth.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I get rather tired of this natural growth.

Mr. BOWERS. Here is the statement with reference to that matter:

Mr. RUDOLPH. We certainly need it, Mr. Chairman. We have had to take a man from the office and put him permanently into the juvenile court, because the work of that court is growing. Last fiscal year this court disposed of 3,387 cases.

Mr. GARDNER. This man's duty would be largely with the juvenile court?

Mr. RUDOLPH. As I said, we have a man up there now. The work in the office is growing to such an extent that we can not get along without the new man.

In addition to that, I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this is accounted for to a certain extent by the normal increase of business.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go back to a preceding paragraph to correct a typographical error. On page 10, line 6, instead of "thirty-six" it should be "fifty-six."

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 6, strike out "thirty-six" and insert "fifty-six."

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. It is a typographical error, simply.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Northeast section schedule: Twenty-two thousand eight hundred dollars.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do it for the purpose of making an inquiry of the chairman. I find upon looking at the estimates that a very large number of improvements have been estimated for in the way of grading, cutting down, paving, and preparing streets, and my attention is especially called to one, an estimate for the improvement of Irving Street, Thirteenth Street to Seventeenth Street, by way of grading. The estimate is \$8,400. Now, I notice that there are some two or three only, perhaps, appropriations in this bill for the northeast part of the city. I would like to know why such an improvement as the one I have referred to is omitted.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, there is always a very considerable list of street improvements—county roads, as they are called outside of Florida Avenue—listed by the commissioners, many more every year than can be appropriated for, at least, that year. It has been the custom of the committee in charge of this bill for a number of years to go with the commissioners and look over these streets which they recommend, in detail. I would say that the commissioners ordinarily place them in the order in which they deem the streets should first be improved. The commissioners did the same thing with the committee this year. We were not able to appropriate all the money desired. The particular street to which the gentleman from Ohio referred is well down in the list. It is important, but there are many other streets regarded as equally important.

Mr. KEIFER. Is it not true that some of the other improvements appropriated for are lower down in the list?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I tried to make that clear, Mr. Chairman, when I said that the subcommittee have habitually, for several years, gone with the commissioners and looked over those streets, and we have not always agreed with the commissioners.

Mr. KEIFER. But I understood the gentleman to say that the commissioners recommended these improvements to be taken up according to their importance and significance, in the order in which they appeared in the estimates. Did the subcommittee overrule them?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. In some cases.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I desire to say to the chairman of the committee that, if it is in order, I desire to offer an amendment to include the matter to which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEIFER] refers.

Mr. KEIFER. I hope the gentleman will do that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is this a project for the improvement of the State of Ohio? [Laughter.]

Mr. ASHBROOK. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio. I think I can answer the gentleman. I believe one citizen of Ohio lives on that street, because I had a letter from him yesterday urging that this improvement be made, and I have no doubt that my two colleagues received similar communications or visits from him.

Mr. STAFFORD. That explains it. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEIFER. The gentleman from Wisconsin has made an insinuation that has no foundation whatever, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not intend to make any insinuation whatever.

Mr. KEIFER. I understand that there is a church located on this street, and the street is only cut through part way to it, and there is a very important reason, which applies to a very large congregation; and if there happens to be somebody interested in the street who is a citizen of Ohio the gentleman from Wisconsin seems to know more about it than I do. I think this is an improvement that ought to have been taken up, and no reason is given by the subcommittee, and I know of none why it has not been made. I therefore move to insert after the paragraph just read—

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I hope the gentleman will wait at least until we reach the place in the bill where the amendment ought to be offered.

Mr. KEIFER. I supposed it came in connection with other estimates that have been considered and favorably reported on, but if this is not the proper place then I will accede to the request of the gentleman. What page would the gentleman prefer to have it on?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. It will come under the head of county roads. We are now on the streets here in the city. We have not reached it yet.

Mr. KEIFER. You are now on page 27?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Yes; it comes later.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Is not this amendment which the gentleman from Ohio suggests for a street inside the city?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Oh, no; it is away out in the suburbs.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase or condemnation of necessary land, paving, and construction of walls, steps, and terraces for connecting Belmont and Fifteenth Streets NW., in accordance with plans approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, \$8,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky makes a point of order against the paragraph. Has the gentleman from Michigan any law to cite to the Chairman?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I quote from the organic act, section 5:

That hereafter when any repairs of streets, avenues, alleys, or sewers within the District of Columbia are to be made, or when new pavements are to be substituted in place of those worn out, new ones laid, or new streets opened, sewers built, or any works the total cost of which shall exceed the sum of \$1,000, notice shall be given in one newspaper in Washington, and if the total cost shall exceed \$5,000, then in one newspaper in each of the cities of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, also for one week, for proposals, with full specifications as to materials for the whole or any portion of the works proposed to be done.

Mr. MANN. What application has that to the paragraph which has been read?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. The point of order, as I understand it, is that we have no right to make an appropriation for the improvement of these streets. We maintain that this section clearly gives that right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. This is legislation. It proposes a condemnation proceeding. It authorizes a condemnation proceeding without any law for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that when a street in the District of Columbia is laid out or authorized it is done by legislation reported from the District of Columbia Committee and passed upon by Congress. Can the gentleman in charge of the bill refer the Chair to the law providing for this particular street?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. The situation in regard to this place is this: This street intersects Fifteenth Street opposite the proposed park on Meridian Hill. At the descent there is 8 or 10 feet abruptly into the street, inaccessible unless steps shall be completed and put up for pedestrians. In order to make the street available at all for vehicular travel it is necessary to deflect from the line so as to get a more gradual descent into Fifteenth Street, and under the organic act we are allowed to make appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman state how much land it is proposed to buy?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. A very little corner.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Can the gentleman give the committee some idea about how many square feet?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. It is an irregular tract, a very small tract.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The paragraph under consideration contains the word "condemnation." Can the gentleman inform the committee whether the commissioners are in shape to buy the land or have it condemned?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. If they can not buy it this authorizes condemnation.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Then that would be clearly legislation, would it not?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Possibly so; but it is one of those cases where it is necessary. It is in plain sight and anybody can see it by going there.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Does not the gentleman feel that this is an exorbitant price for a small piece of land?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. The board of commissioners are not in the habit of doing business in that way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has requested to be furnished with a copy of the organic act under which it is claimed authority is granted for making this appropriation, and he is referred to section 5 of the act, which reads as follows:

That hereafter when any repairs of streets, avenues, alleys, or sewers within the District of Columbia are to be made, or when new pavements are to be substituted in place of those worn out, new ones laid, or new streets opened, sewers built, or any works the total cost of which shall exceed the sum of \$1,000, notice shall be given in one newspaper in Washington, and if the total cost shall exceed \$5,000, then in one newspaper in each of the cities of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, also for one week, for proposals, with full specifications as to materials for the whole or any portion of the works proposed to be done.

The query propounded to the gentleman from Michigan by the Chair was as to this being a street, it being the understanding of the Chair that all streets in the District of Columbia are in some way authorized or designated as streets. It seems to the Chair that the paragraph itself refers to condemnation of land for the opening of a new street. The Chair may be in error.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I tried to make it clear. The street intersects at right angles, the street running parallel with the park on the east side and descends abruptly 8 or 10 feet into Fifteenth Street, rendering it useless for vehicles. In order to make the street available for vehicular traffic it is necessary to deflect a little from the present line of the street.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not condemnation of property.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. It may be if it can not be purchased.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. We have no right to purchase or condemn without authority of law to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that there is no way by which the boundaries of a street may be fixed or changed except by an act of Congress. Can the gentleman refer the Chair to any specific act by which the boundaries of this street have been fixed?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I will move to amend the paragraph by striking out the word "condemnation."

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I insist on the ruling, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point as to which the Chair desires information is the status of this particular land, whether or not it is at present a street, or part of a street, authorized by law, and the law by which it is made a street.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is a desire that the committee do now rise in order that other matters may be considered before the House, and I ask to let this matter go over until we next consider the bill. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee determined to rise; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House bill 31856, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 10327. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 10328. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 10318. An act authorizing the Commissioner of the General Land Office to grant further extensions of time within which to make proof on desert-land entries; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

OSAGE CIVILIZATION FUND.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a House document (No. 1319) a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of receipts, disbursements, and reimbursements relating to the civilization fund, created by Article I of the treaty with the Osage Indians of September 29, 1865.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman if the Committee on Indian Affairs regards it as particularly desirable to have this in permanent form.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, answering the question of the gentleman from Illinois, this information is of great value in determining a question that has been before Congress for a great many years. I will say further, that the Committee on Indian Affairs has had printed for its own use this letter, and all that is now necessary is that the word "Document" should be printed upon it, together with the number.

Mr. MANN. That will put it in permanent form?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

CANADIAN RECIPROCITY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States (S. Doc. No. 787), which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In my annual message of December 6, 1910, I stated that the policy of broader and closer trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, which was initiated in the adjustment of the maximum and minimum provisions of the tariff act of August 5, 1909, had proved mutually beneficial, and that it justified further efforts for the readjustment of the commercial relations of the two countries. I also informed you that, by my direction, the Secretary of State had dispatched two representatives of the Department of State as special commissioners to Ottawa to confer with representatives of the Dominion Government, that they were authorized to take steps to formulate a reciprocal trade agreement, and that the Ottawa conferences thus begun had been adjourned to be resumed in Washington.

On the 7th of the present month two cabinet ministers came to Washington as representatives of the Dominion Government, and the conferences were continued between them and the Secretary of State. The result of the negotiations was that on the 21st instant a reciprocal trade agreement was reached, the text of which is herewith transmitted with accompanying correspondence and other data.

One by one the controversies resulting from the uncertainties which attended the partition of British territory on the American Continent at the close of the Revolution, and which were inevitable under the then conditions, have been eliminated—some by arbitration and some by direct negotiation. The merits of these disputes, many of them extending through a century, need not now be reviewed. They related to the settlement of boundaries, the definition of rights of navigation, the interpretation of treaties, and many other subjects.

Through the friendly sentiments, the energetic efforts, and the broadly patriotic views of successive administrations, and especially of that of my immediate predecessor, all these questions have been settled. The most acute related to the Atlantic fisheries, and this long-standing controversy, after amicable negotiation, was referred to The Hague Tribunal. The judgment of that august international court has been accepted by the people of both countries and a satisfactory agreement in pursuance of the judgment has ended completely the controversy. An equitable arrangement has recently been reached between our Interstate Commerce Commission and the similar body in Canada in regard to through rates on the transportation lines between the two countries.

The path having been thus opened for the improvement of commercial relations, a reciprocal trade agreement is the logical sequence of all that has been accomplished in disposing of matters of a diplomatic and controversial character. The identity of interest of two peoples linked together by race, language, political institutions, and geographical proximity offers the foundation. The contribution to the industrial advancement of our own country by the migration across the boundary of the thrifty and industrious Canadians of English, Scotch, and French origin is now repaid by the movement of large numbers of our own sturdy farmers to the northwest of Canada, thus giving their labor, their means, and their experience to the development of that section, with its agricultural possibilities.

The guiding movement in seeking adjustment of trade relations between two countries so situated geographically should be to give play to productive forces as far as practicable, regardless of political boundaries. While equivalency should be sought in an arrangement of this character, an exact balance of financial gain is neither imperative nor attainable. No yardstick can measure the benefits to the two peoples of this freer commercial intercourse and no trade agreement should be judged wholly by customhouse statistics.

We have reached a stage in our own development that calls for a statesmanlike and broad view of our future economic status and its requirements. We have drawn upon our natural resources in such a way as to invite attention to their necessary limit. This has properly aroused effort to conserve them, to avoid their waste, and to restrict their use to our necessities. We have so increased in population and in our consumption of food products and the other necessities of life, hitherto supplied largely from our own country, that unless we materially increase our production we can see before us a change in our economic position from that of a country selling to the world food and natural products of the farm and forest to one consuming and importing them. Excluding cotton, which is ex-

ceptional, a radical change is already shown in our exports in the falling off in the amount of our agricultural products sold abroad and a corresponding marked increase in our manufactures exported. A farsighted policy requires that if we can enlarge our supply of natural resources, and especially of food products and the necessities of life, without substantial injury to any of our producing and manufacturing classes, we should take steps to do so now. We have on the north of us a country contiguous to ours for 3,000 miles, with natural resources of the same character as ours which have not been drawn upon as ours have been, and in the development of which the conditions as to wages and character of the wage earner and transportation to market differ but little from those prevailing with us. The difference is not greater than it is between different States of our own country or between different Provinces of the Dominion of Canada. Ought we not, then, to arrange a commercial agreement with Canada, if we can, by which we shall have direct access to her great supply of natural products without an obstructing or prohibitory tariff? This is not a violation of the protective principle, as that has been authoritatively announced by those who uphold it, because that principle does not call for a tariff between this country and one whose conditions as to production, population, and wages are so like ours, and when our common boundary line of 3,000 miles in itself must make a radical distinction between our commercial treatment of Canada and of any other country.

The Dominion has greatly prospered. It has an active, aggressive, and intelligent people. They are coming to the parting of the ways. They must soon decide whether they are to regard themselves as isolated permanently from our markets by a perpetual wall or whether we are to be commercial friends. If we give them reason to take the former view, can we complain if they adopt methods denying access to certain of their natural resources except upon conditions quite unfavorable to us? A notable instance of such a possibility may be seen in the conditions surrounding the supply of pulp wood and the manufacture of print paper, for which we have made a conditional provision in the agreement, believed to be equitable. Should we not now, therefore, before their policy has become too crystallized and fixed for change, meet them in a spirit of real concession, facilitate commerce between the two countries, and thus greatly increase the natural resources available to our people?

I do not wish to hold out the prospect that the unrestricted interchange of food products will greatly and at once reduce their cost to the people of this country. Moreover, the present small amount of Canadian surplus for export as compared with that of our own production and consumption would make the reduction gradual. Excluding the element of transportation, the price of staple food products, especially of cereals, is much the same the world over, and the recent increase in price has been the result of a world-wide cause. But a source of supply as near as Canada would certainly help to prevent speculative fluctuations, would steady local price movements, and would postpone the effect of a further world increase in the price of leading commodities entering into the cost of living, if that be inevitable.

In the reciprocal trade agreement numerous additions are made to the free list. These include not only food commodities, such as cattle, fish, wheat and other grains, fresh vegetables, fruits, and dairy products, but also rough lumber and raw materials useful to our own industries. Free lumber we ought to have. By giving our people access to Canadian forests we shall reduce the consumption of our own, which, in the hands of comparatively few owners, now have a value that requires the enlargement of our available timber resources.

Natural, and especially food, products being placed on the free list, the logical development of a policy of reciprocity in rates on secondary food products, or foodstuffs partly manufactured, is, where they can not also be entirely exempted from duty, to lower the duties in accord with the exemption of the raw material from duty. This has been followed in the trade agreement which has been negotiated. As an example, wheat is made free and the rate on flour is equalized on a lower basis. In the same way, live animals being made free, the duties on fresh meats and on secondary meat products and on canned meats are substantially lowered. Fresh fruits and vegetables being placed on the free list, the duties on canned goods of these classes are reduced.

Both countries in their industrial development have to meet the competition of lower-priced labor in other parts of the world. Both follow the policy of encouraging the development of home industries by protective duties within reasonable limits. This has made it difficult to extend the principle of reciprocal rates to many manufactured commodities, but after much nego-

tiation and effort we have succeeded in doing so in various and important instances.

The benefit to our widespread agricultural-implement industry from the reduction of Canadian duties in the agreement is clear. Similarly the new, widely distributed, and expanding motor-vehicle industry of the United States is given access to the Dominion market on advantageous terms.

My purpose in making a reciprocal trade agreement with Canada has been not only to obtain one which would be mutually advantageous to both countries, but one which also would be truly national in its scope as applied to our own country and would be of benefit to all sections. The currents of business and the transportation facilities that will be established forward and back across the border can not but inure to the benefit of the boundary States. Some readjustments may be needed, but in a very short period the advantage of the free commercial exchange between communities separated only by short distances will strikingly manifest itself. That the broadening of the sources of food supplies; that the opening of the timber resources of the Dominion to our needs; that the addition to the supply of raw materials will be limited to no particular section does not require demonstration. The same observation applies to the markets which the Dominion offers us in exchange. As an illustration, it has been found possible to obtain free entry into Canada for fresh fruits and vegetables—a matter of special value to the South and to the Pacific coast in disposing of their products in their season. It also has been practicable to obtain free entry for the cottonseed oil of the South—a most important product with a rapidly expanding consumption in the Dominion.

The entire foreign trade of Canada in the last fiscal year, 1910, was \$655,000,000. The imports were \$376,000,000, and of this amount the United States contributed more than \$223,000,000. The reduction in the duties imposed by Canada will largely increase this amount and give us even a larger share of her market than we now enjoy, great as that is.

The data accompanying the text of the trade agreement exhibit in detail the facts which are here set forth briefly and in outline only. They furnish full information on which the legislation recommended may be based. Action on the agreement submitted will not interfere with such revision of our own tariff on imports from all countries as Congress may decide to adopt.

Reciprocity with Canada must necessarily be chiefly confined in its effect on the cost of living to food and forest products. The question of the cost of clothing as affected by duty on textiles and their raw materials, so much mooted, is not within the scope of an agreement with Canada, because she raises comparatively few wool sheep, and her textile manufactures are unimportant.

This trade agreement, if entered into, will cement the friendly relations with the Dominion which have resulted from the satisfactory settlement of the controversies that have lasted for a century, and further promote good feeling between kindred peoples. It will extend the market for numerous products of the United States among the inhabitants of a prosperous neighboring country with an increasing population and an increasing purchasing power. It will deepen and widen the sources of food supply in contiguous territory, and will facilitate the movement and distribution of these foodstuffs.

The geographical proximity, the closer relation of blood, common sympathies, and identical moral and social ideas furnish very real and striking reasons why this agreement ought to be viewed from a high plane.

Since becoming a nation, Canada has been our good neighbor, immediately contiguous across a wide continent without artificial or natural barrier except navigable waters used in common.

She has cost us nothing in the way of preparations for defense against her possible assault, and she never will. She has sought to agree with us quickly when differences have disturbed our relations. She shares with us common traditions and aspirations. I feel I have correctly interpreted the wish of the American people by expressing in the arrangement now submitted to Congress for its approval, their desire for a more intimate and cordial relationship with Canada. I therefore earnestly hope that the measure will be promptly enacted into law.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 26, 1911.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the trade agreement and correspondence which accompanied the message.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The trade agreement and correspondence referred to are as follows:

[Correspondence embodying an agreement between the Department of State and the Canadian Government in regard to reciprocal tariff legislation.]

LETTER FROM THE CANADIAN MINISTERS TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE, WITH SCHEDULES ANNEXED.

WASHINGTON, January 21, 1911.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: 1. The negotiations initiated by the President several months ago, through your communication to his excellency the British ambassador, respecting a reciprocal tariff arrangement between the United States and Canada, and since carried on directly between representatives of the Governments of the two countries, have now, we are happy to say, reached a stage which gives reasonable assurance of a conclusion satisfactory to both countries.

2. We desire to set forth what we understand to be the contemplated arrangement and to ask you to confirm it.

3. It is agreed that the desired tariff changes shall not take the formal shape of a treaty, but that the Governments of the two countries will use their utmost efforts to bring about such changes by concurrent legislation at Washington and Ottawa.

4. The Governments of the two countries having made this agreement from the conviction that, if confirmed by the necessary legislative authorities, it will benefit the people on both sides of the border line, we may reasonably hope and expect that the arrangement, if so confirmed, will remain in operation for a considerable period. Only this expectation on the part of both Governments would justify the time and labor that have been employed in the maturing of the proposed measures. Nevertheless, it is distinctly understood that we do not attempt to bind for the future the action of the United States Congress or the Parliament of Canada, but that each of these authorities shall be absolutely free to make any change of tariff policy or of any other matter covered by the present arrangement that may be deemed expedient. We look for the continuance of the arrangement, not because either party is bound to it, but because of our conviction that the more liberal trade policy thus to be established will be viewed by the people of the United States and Canada as one which will strengthen the friendly relations now happily prevailing and promote the commercial interests of both countries.

5. As respects a considerable list of articles produced in both countries, we have been able to agree that they shall be reciprocally free. A list of the articles to be admitted free of duty into the United States when imported from Canada, and into Canada when imported from the United States, is set forth in Schedule A.

6. As respects another group of articles, we have been able to agree upon common rates of duty to be applied to such articles when imported into the United States from Canada or into Canada from the United States. A list of these articles, with the rates of duty, is set forth in Schedule B.

7. In a few instances it has been found that the adoption of a common rate will be inconvenient and therefore exceptions have to be made.

8. Schedule C specifies articles upon which the United States will levy the rates therein set forth when such articles are imported from Canada.

9. Schedule D specifies articles upon which Canada will levy the rates therein set forth when such articles are imported from the United States.

10. With respect to the discussions that have taken place concerning the duties upon the several grades of pulp, printing paper, etc.—mechanically ground wood pulp, chemical wood pulp, bleached and unbleached, news printing paper and other printing paper and board made from wood pulp, of the value not exceeding 4 cents per pound at the place of shipment—we note that you desire to provide that such articles from Canada shall be made free of duty in the United States only upon certain conditions respecting the shipment of pulp wood from Canada. It is necessary that we should point out that this is a matter in which we are not in a position to make any agreement. The restrictions at present existing in Canada are of a provincial character. They have been adopted by several of the Provinces with regard to what are believed to be provincial interests. We have neither the right nor the desire to interfere with the provincial authorities in the free exercise of their constitutional powers in the administration of their public lands. The provisions you are proposing to make respecting the conditions upon which these classes of pulp and paper may be imported into the United States free of duty must necessarily be for the present inoperative. Whether the provincial governments will desire to in any way modify their regulations with a view to securing the free admission of pulp and paper from their Provinces into the market of the United States, must be a question for the provincial authorities to decide. In the meantime, the present duties on pulp and paper imported from the United States into Canada will remain. Whenever pulp and paper of the classes already mentioned are admitted into the United States free of duty from all parts of Canada, then similar articles, when imported from the United States, shall be admitted into Canada free of duty.

11. The tariff changes proposed might not alone be sufficient to fully bring about the more favorable conditions which both parties desire. It is conceivable that customs regulations which are deemed essential in some cases might operate unfavorably upon the trade between the United States and Canada and that such regulations, if made without due regard to the special conditions of the two countries, might to some extent defeat the good purpose of the present arrangement. It is agreed that the utmost care shall be taken by both Governments to see that only such customs regulations are adopted as are reasonably necessary for the protection of the treasury against fraud; that no regulation shall be made or maintained which unreasonably hampers the more liberal exchange of commodities now proposed; that representations on either side as to the unfavorable operation of any regulation will receive from the other all due consideration, with the earnest purpose of removing any just cause of complaint; and that, if any further legislation is found necessary to enable either Government to carry out the purpose of this provision, such legislation will be sought from Congress or Parliament, as the case may be.

12. The Government of Canada agree that, until otherwise determined by them, the licenses hitherto issued to United States fishing vessels under the provisions of section 3 of chapter 47 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, granting to such vessels certain privileges on the Atlantic coast of Canada shall continue to be issued and that the fee to be paid to the Government of Canada for such license by the owner or com-

mander of any such United States vessel shall hereafter be \$1 per annum.

13. It is understood that upon a day and hour to be agreed upon between the two Governments the President of the United States will communicate to Congress the conclusions now reached and recommend the adoption of such legislation as may be necessary on the part of the United States to give effect to the proposed arrangement.

14. It is understood that simultaneously with the sending of such communication to the United States Congress by the President the Canadian Government will communicate to the Parliament of Canada the conclusions now reached and will thereupon take the necessary steps to procure such legislation as is required to give effect to the proposed arrangement.

15. Such legislation on the part of the United States may contain a provision that it shall not come into operation until the United States Government are assured that corresponding legislation has been or will be passed by the Parliament of Canada; and in like manner the legislation on the part of Canada may contain a provision that it shall not come into operation until the Government of Canada are assured that corresponding legislation has been passed or will be passed by the Congress of the United States.

Yours, faithfully,

W. S. FIELDING.
WM. PATERSON.

The honorable P. C. KNOX,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

SCHEDULE A.—Articles the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States to be admitted into Canada free of duty when imported from the United States, and reciprocally articles the growth, product or manufacture of Canada to be admitted into the United States free of duty when imported from Canada.

Live animals, viz: Cattle, horses and mules, swine, sheep, lambs, and all other live animals.

Poultry, dead or alive.

Wheat, rye, oats, barley, and buckwheat; dried peas and beans, edible.

Corn, sweet corn, or maize (except into Canada for distillation).

Hay, straw, and cowpeas.

Fresh vegetables, viz: Potatoes, sweet potatoes, yams, turnips, onions, cabbages, and all other vegetables in their natural state.

Fresh fruits, viz: Apples, pears, peaches, grapes, berries, and all other edible fruits in their natural state.

Dried fruits, viz: Apples, peaches, pears, and apricots, dried, desiccated, or evaporated.

Dairy products, viz: Butter, cheese, and fresh milk and cream. *Provided*, That cans actually used in the transportation of milk or cream may be passed back and forth between the two countries free of duty, under such regulations as the respective Governments may prescribe.

Eggs of barnyard fowl, in the shell.

Honey.

Cottonseed oil.

Seeds, viz: Flaxseed or linseed, cottonseed, and other oil seeds; grass seed, including timothy and clover seed; garden, field, and other seed not herein otherwise provided for, when in packages weighing over 1 pound each (not including flower seeds).

Fish of all kinds, fresh, frozen, packed in ice, salted or preserved in any form, except sardines and other fish preserved in oil; and shellfish of all kinds, including oysters, lobsters, and clams in any state, fresh or packed, and coverings of the foregoing.

Seal, herring, whale, and other fish oil, including cod oil.

Salt.

Mineral waters, natural, not in bottles or jugs.

Timber, hewn, sided or squared otherwise than by sawing, and round timber used for spars or in building wharves.

Sawn boards, planks, deals and other lumber, not further manufactured than sawed.

Paving posts, railroad ties, and telephone, trolley, electric light, and telegraph poles of cedar or other woods.

Wooden staves of all kinds, not further manufactured than listed or jointed, and stave bolts.

Pickets and palings.

Plaster rock or gypsum, crude, not ground.

Mica, unmanufactured or rough trimmed only, and mica ground or bolted.

Feldspar, crude, powdered, or ground.

Asbestos not further manufactured than ground.

Fluorspar, crude, not ground.

Glycerine, crude, not purified.

Talc, ground, bolted or precipitated, naturally or artificially, not for toilet use.

Sulphate of soda, or salt cake; and soda ash.

Extracts of hemlock bark.

Carbon electrodes.

Brass in bars and rods, in coil or otherwise, not less than 6 feet in length, or brass in strips, sheets, or plates, not polished, planished, or coated.

Cream separators of every description, and parts thereof imported for repair of the foregoing.

Rolled iron or steel sheets, or plates, No. 14 gauge or thinner, galvanized or coated with zinc, tin, or other metal, or not.

Crucible cast-steel wire, valued at not less than 6 cents per pound.

Galvanized iron or steel wire, curved or not, Nos. 9, 12, and 13 wire gauge.

Typecasting and typesetting machines and parts thereof, adapted for use in printing offices.

Barbed fencing wire of iron or steel, galvanized or not.

Coke.

Rolled round wire rods in the coil, of iron or steel, not over three-eighths of an inch in diameter and not smaller than No. 6 wire gauge.

Pulp of wood mechanically ground; pulp of wood, chemical, bleached or unbleached; news print paper, and other paper, and paper board, manufactured from mechanical wood pulp or from chemical wood pulp, or of which such pulp is the component material of chief value, colored in the pulp, or not colored, and valued at not more than 4 cents per pound, not including printed or decorated wall paper.

Provided, That such paper and board, valued at 4 cents per pound or less, and wood pulp, being the products of Canada, when imported therefrom directly into the United States, shall be admitted free of duty on the condition precedent that no export duty, export license fee, or other export charge of any kind whatsoever (whether in the form of additional charge or license fee or otherwise) or any prohibition or restriction in any way of the exportation (whether by law, order,

regulation, contractual relation, or otherwise, directly or indirectly) shall have been imposed upon such paper, board, or wood pulp, or the wood used in the manufacture of such paper, board, or wood pulp, or the wood pulp used in the manufacture of such paper or board:

Provided also, That such wood pulp, paper, or board, being the products of the United States, shall only be admitted free of duty into Canada from the United States when such wood pulp, paper, or board, being the products of Canada, are admitted from all parts of Canada free of duty into the United States.

NOTE.—It is understood that fresh fruits to be admitted free of duty into the United States from Canada do not include lemons, oranges, limes, grapefruit, shaddocks, pomelos, or pineapples.

It is also understood that fish oil, whale oil, seal oil, and fish of all kinds, being the product of fisheries carried on by the fishermen of the United States, shall be admitted into Canada as the product of the United States, and similarly that fish oil, whale oil, seal oil, and fish of all kinds, being the product of fisheries carried on by the fishermen of Canada, shall be admitted into the United States as the product of Canada.

SCHEDULE B.—Articles the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States to be admitted into Canada at the undermentioned rates of duty when imported from the United States; and reciprocally the same articles the growth, product, or manufacture of Canada to be admitted into the United States at identical rates of duty when imported from Canada.

Articles.	Rates of duties.
Fresh meats, viz: Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and all other fresh or refrigerated meats excepting game.....per pound..	One and one-quarter cents.
Bacon and hams, not in tins or jars.....per pound..	One and one-quarter cents.
Meats of all kinds, dried, smoked, salted, in brine, or prepared or preserved in any manner, not otherwise herein provided for, per pound.....	One and one-quarter cents.
Canned meats and canned poultry.....	Twenty per cent ad valorem.
Extract of meat, fluid or not.....	Twenty per cent ad valorem.
Lard, and compounds thereof, cottolene and cotton stearine, and animal stearine.....per pound..	One and one-quarter cents.
Tallow.....per 100 pounds..	Forty cents.
Egg yolk, egg albumen and blood albumen.....	Seven and one-half per cent ad valorem.
Fish (except shell fish) by whatever name known, packed in oil, in tin boxes or cans, including the weight of the package:	
(a) When weighing over twenty ounces and not over thirty-six ounces each.....per package..	Five cents.
(b) When weighing over twelve ounces and not over twenty ounces each.....per package..	Four cents.
(c) When weighing twelve ounces each or less per package..	Two cents.
(d) When weighing thirty-six ounces each or more, or when packed in oil, in bottles, jars, or kegs.....	Thirty per cent ad valorem.
Tomatoes and other vegetables, including corn, in cans or other air-tight packages, and including the weight of the package.....per pound..	One and one-quarter cents.
Wheat flour and semolina; and rye flour, per barrel of 196 pounds.....	Fifty cents.
Oatmeal and rolled oats, including the weight of paper covering.....per 100 pounds..	Fifty cents.
Corn meal.....per 100 pounds..	Twelve and one-half cents.
Barley malt.....per 100 pounds..	Forty-five cents.
Barley, pot, pearled and patent.....per pound..	One-half cent.
Buckwheat flour or meal.....per pound..	One-half cent.
Split peas, dried.....per bushel of 60 pounds..	Seven and one-half cents.
Prepared cereal foods, not otherwise provided for herein.....	Seventeen and one-half per cent ad valorem.
Bran, middlings and other offals of grain used for animal food, per 100 pounds.....	Twelve and one-half cents.

SCHEDULE B.—Articles the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States to be admitted into Canada, etc.—Continued.

Articles.	Rates of duties.
Macaroni and vermicelli.....per pound..	One cent.
Biscuits, wafers and cakes, when sweetened with sugar, honey, molasses or other material.....	Twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
Biscuits, wafers, cakes and other baked articles composed in whole or in part of eggs or any kind of flour or meal when combined with chocolate, nuts, fruits or confectionery; also candied peel, candied pop-corn, candied nuts, candied fruits, sugar candy and confectionery of all kinds.....	Thirty-two and one-half per cent ad valorem.
Maple sugar and maple syrup.....per pound..	One cent.
Pickles, including pickled nuts; sauces of all kinds, and fish paste or sauce.....	Thirty-two and one-half per cent ad valorem.
Cherry juice and prune juice, or prune wine, and other fruit juices, and fruit syrup, non-alcoholic.....	Seventeen and a half per cent ad valorem.
Mineral waters and imitations of natural mineral waters, in bottles or jugs.....	Seventeen and a half per cent ad valorem.
Essential oils.....	Seven and a half per cent ad valorem.
Grape vines; gooseberry, raspberry and currant bushes.....	Seventeen and a half per cent ad valorem.
Farm wagons, and finished parts thereof.....	Twenty-two and a half per cent ad valorem.
Ploughs, tooth and disc harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse-rakes, cultivators; threshing machines, including windstackers, baggers, weighers, and self-feeders therefor, and finished parts thereof imported for repair of the foregoing.....	Fifteen per cent ad valorem.
Portable engines with boilers, in combination, horse powers and traction engines, for farm purposes; hay loaders, potato diggers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm or field rollers, manure spreaders, weeders and windmills; and finished parts thereof imported for repair of the foregoing, except shafting.....	Twenty per cent ad valorem.
Grindstones of sandstone, not mounted, finished or not, per 100 pounds.....	Five cents.
Freestone, granite, sandstone, limestone, and all other monumental or building stone, except marble, brachia, and onyx, unmanufactured, or not dressed, hewn or polished.....	Twelve and a half per cent ad valorem.
Roofing slates.....per 100 square feet..	Fifty-five cents.
Vitrified paving blocks, not ornamented or decorated in any manner, and paving blocks of stone.....	Seventeen and a half per cent ad valorem.
Oxide of iron, as a colour.....	Twenty-two and a half per cent ad valorem.
Asbestos further manufactured than ground; manufactures of asbestos, or articles of which asbestos is the component material of chief value, including woven fabrics wholly or in chief value of asbestos.....	Twenty-two and a half per cent ad valorem.

SCHEDULE B.—Articles the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States to be admitted into Canada, etc.—Continued.

Articles.	Rates of duties.
Printing ink.....	Seventeen and a half per cent ad valorem.
Cutlery, plated or not, viz, pocket knives, pen knives, scissors and shears, knives and forks for household purposes, and table steels.....	Twenty-seven and a half per cent ad valorem.
Bells and gongs; brass corners and rules for printers.....	Twenty-seven and a half per cent ad valorem.
Basins, urinals and other plumbing fixtures for bath rooms and lavatories; bath tubs, sinks and laundry tubs, of earthenware, stone, cement or clay, or of other material.....	Thirty-two and a half per cent ad valorem.
Brass band instruments.....	Twenty-two and a half per cent ad valorem.
Clocks, watches, time recorders, clock and watch keys, clock cases, and clock movements.....	Twenty-seven and a half per cent ad valorem.
Printers' wooden cases and cabinets for holding type.....	Twenty-seven and a half per cent ad valorem.
Wood flour.....	Twenty-two and a half per cent ad valorem.
Canoes and small boats of wood, not power boats.....	Twenty-two and a half per cent ad valorem.
Feathers, crude, not dressed, coloured or otherwise manufactured.....	Twelve and a half per cent ad valorem.
Antiseptic surgical dressings, such as absorbent cotton, cotton wool, lint, lamb's wool, tow, jute, gauzes and oakum, prepared for use as surgical dressings, plain or medicated; surgical trusses, pessaries, and suspensory bandages of all kinds.....	Seventeen and a half per cent ad valorem.
Plate glass, not bevelled, in sheets or panes exceeding seven square feet each, and not exceeding twenty-five square feet each.....	Twenty-five per cent ad valorem.
Motor vehicles, other than for railways and tramways, and automobiles, and parts thereof, not including rubber tires.....	Thirty per cent ad valorem.
Iron or steel digesters for the manufacture of wood pulp.....	Twenty-seven and a half per cent ad valorem.
Musical instrument cases, fancy cases or boxes, portfolios, satchels, reticules, card cases, purses, pocket books, fly books for artificial flies, all the foregoing composed wholly or in chief value of leather.....	Thirty per cent ad valorem.

SCHEDULE C.—Articles the growth, product, or manufacture of Canada to be admitted into the United States at the undermentioned special rates of duty when imported from Canada.

Articles.	Rates of duties.
Aluminum in crude form.....per pound..	Five cents.
Aluminum in plates, sheets, bars and rods.....per pound..	Eight cents.
Laths.....per 1,000 pieces..	Ten cents.
Shingles.....per thousand..	Thirty cents.

SCHEDULE C.—Articles the growth, product, or manufacture of Canada to be admitted into the United States, etc.—Continued.

Articles.	Rates of duties.
Sawed boards, planks, deals and other lumber:	
Planed or finished on one side.....per M feet B. M.	Fifty cents.
Planed or finished on one side and tongued and grooved, or planed or finished on two sides.....per M feet B. M.	Seventy-five cents.
Planed or finished on three sides, or planed and finished on two sides and tongued and grooved.....per M feet B. M.	One dollar and twelve and a half cents.
Planed and finished on four sides.....per M feet B. M.	One dollar and fifty cents.
And in estimating board measure under this schedule no deduction shall be made on board measure on account of planing, tonguing, and grooving.	
Iron ore, including manganiferous iron ore, and the dross or residuum from burnt pyrites.....per ton of 2,240 pounds..	Ten cents.
Coal slack or culm, of all kinds, such as will pass through a half-inch screen.....per ton of 2,240 pounds..	Fifteen cents.

SCHEDULE D.—Articles the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States to be admitted into Canada at the undermentioned special rates of duty when imported from the United States.

Articles.	Rates of duties.
Cement, Portland, and hydraulic or water lime in barrels, bags, or casks, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.....per 100 pounds..	Eleven cents.
Trees, viz: Apple, cherry, peach, pear, plum, and quince, of all kinds, and small peach trees known as June buds.....each..	Two and a half cents.
Condensed milk, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.....per pound..	Two cents.
Biscuits without added sweetening.....	Twenty per cent ad valorem.
Fruits in air-tight cans or other air-tight packages, the weight of the cans or other packages to be included in the weight for duty.....per pound..	Two cents.
Peanuts, shelled.....per pound..	One cent.
Peanuts, unshelled.....per pound..	A half cent.
Coal, bituminous, round and run of mine, including bituminous coal such as will not pass through a three-quarter inch screen.....per ton..	Forty-five cents.

REPLY OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

WASHINGTON, January 21, 1911.

The Hon. W. S. FIELDING and the Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON,
Washington.

GENTLEMEN: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of this date in relation to the negotiations initiated by the President several months ago for a reciprocal trade arrangement between the United States and Canada, in which you set forth and ask me to confirm your understanding of the results of our recent conferences in continuation of these negotiations.

I take great pleasure in replying that your statement of the proposed arrangement is entirely in accord with my understanding of it.

It is a matter of some regret on our part that we have been unable to adjust our differences on the subject of wood pulp, pulp wood, and print paper. We recognize the difficulties to which you refer growing out of the nature of the relations between the Dominion and Provincial Governments, and for the present we must be content with the conditional arrangement which has been proposed in Schedule A attached to your letter.

I fully appreciate the importance, to which you call attention, of not permitting a too rigid customs administration to interfere with the successful operation of our agreement, if it is approved by the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada, and I desire to confirm your statement of our understanding on this point. I am satisfied that the spirit evinced on both sides gives assurance that every effort will be made to secure the full measure of benefit which is contemplated in entering into this arrangement.

The assurance that you give that the Dominion Government proposes to require only a nominal fee from the fishing vessels of the United States for the privileges in Canadian waters for which heretofore a charge of \$1.50 per ton for each vessel has been required is most gratifying.

I heartily concur in your statement of the purposes inspiring the negotiations and in the views expressed by you as to the mutual benefits to be derived by both countries in the event our work is confirmed,

and I take this opportunity to assure you, on behalf of the President, of his appreciation of the cordial spirit in which you have met us in these negotiations.

I have the honor to be, gentlemen, your obedient servant,

P. C. KNOX.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE CANADIAN MINISTERS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 21, 1911.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We have received with much satisfaction your letter of this date in which you have confirmed our understanding of the arrangement which is being made between us respecting trade relations between the United States and Canada.

In bringing the negotiations to a close permit us to express our warmest appreciation of the spirit in which the whole subject has been dealt with by the President and yourself and of the unvarying courtesy which we have received in Washington from all the officials of your Government with whom we have been brought in contact.

Yours, faithfully,

W. S. FIELDING.

WM. PATERSON.

The Hon. P. C. KNOX,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Indian appropriation bill, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Indian appropriation bill, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, for the present I object.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ELLIS for one day from 12 o'clock noon, January 26, 1911, on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT.

Then, on motion of Mr. GARDNER of Michigan (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until Friday, January 27, 1911, at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a list of leases granted under the act approved July 28, 1892 (H. Doc. No. 1325); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health and Marine-Hospital Service for the fiscal year 1910 (H. Doc. No. 1323); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a recommendation as to construction of a central power plant in Washington, D. C. (H. Doc. No. 1324); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a recommendation as to reconstruction of office building at Shiloh National Military Park (H. Doc. No. 1322); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of appropriation for claim of owners of S. S. *Munnatawket* (H. Doc. No. 1321); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for military and post roads, bridges, and trails in Alaska (H. Doc. No. 1320); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statements of receipts and disbursements of civilization fund created by treaty with the Osage Indians (H. Doc. No. 1319); ordered to be printed as a House document.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HULL of Iowa, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 9904) granting certain rights of way on the Fort D. A. Russell Military Reservation at Cheyenne, Wyo., for railroad and county road pur-

poses, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1996), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BENNET of New York, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the House joint resolution 263, reported in lieu thereof the resolution (H. J. Res. 279) directing the Commission on Universal Peace to report upon a plan for commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the signing of the treaty of Ghent, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1995), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES, from the Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers, to which was referred the reports of the heads of the departments, reported the same, accompanied by a report (No. 1997), which said report was referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred sundry bills of the House, reported in lieu thereof the bill (H. R. 32128) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, accompanied by a report (No. 1998), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 31115) granting an increase of pension to James Tompatch, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LUNDIN: A bill (H. R. 32124) to change the name of oleomargarine to margarine, protect dealers, provide better means of collecting taxes, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 32125) to authorize the acquisition of a site for a public building at Glenwood, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington (by request): A bill (H. R. 32126) providing for the discontinuance of the grade of post noncommissioned staff officer and creating the grade of warrant officer in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOBSON: A bill (H. R. 32127) to encourage the development of the American merchant marine and to promote commerce and the national defense; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 32129) to protect American trade and American shipping from foreign monopolies; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DENBY: Resolution (H. Res. 932) to pay Nellie M. Wakefield \$900 for services rendered; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. RUCKER of Colorado: Resolution (H. Res. 933) to investigate wireless telegraph system; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAMER: A memorial of the Legislature of Idaho requesting the Congress to sanction the holding of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition at San Francisco; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEVER: A memorial of the Legislature of South Carolina concerning the Panama Exposition; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 32130) granting a pension to Dr. Wilmont E. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32131) for the relief of the heirs of Jesus Maria Candelaria, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32132) granting an increase of pension to James F. Bandy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 32133) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 32134) granting a pension to William F. Hass; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32135) for the relief of James D. Evans; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 32136) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 32137) for the relief of John Allen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 32138) for the relief of the heirs of John B. Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 32139) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Bickel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONRY: A bill (H. R. 32140) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Mahoney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 32141) granting a pension to John J. Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 32142) granting an increase of pension to Herbert M. Nogle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORNES: A bill (H. R. 32143) granting an increase of pension to William W. Seely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOEBEL: A bill (H. R. 32144) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Troy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA: A bill (H. R. 32145) granting an increase of pension to John W. Griffith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32146) granting an increase of pension to Joseph F. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 32147) granting an increase of pension to John W. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32148) granting an increase of pension to Barney A. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 32149) granting an increase of pension to William H. Chaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 32150) providing for the relief of the heirs of Nathan Reger; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 32151) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hooser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 32152) for the relief of George Swisher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 32153) granting a pension to George W. Byrd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 32154) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Matthews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32155) granting an increase of pension to John Lennon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32156) granting an increase of pension to Peter Hadley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32157) granting an increase of pension to Michael J. Tooney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KRONMILLER: A bill (H. R. 32158) granting a pension to Mary E. Dodge Reville; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 32159) for the relief of George Schleinkofer; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MALBY: A bill (H. R. 32160) granting a pension to Martha E. Snell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32161) granting an increase of pension to Patrick O'Connor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 32162) to reimburse and indemnify the town of Frederick, in the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 32163) granting a pension to Thacher T. Baxter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 32164) granting a pension to Garland Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32165) for the relief of the heirs of W. L. Dillon; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TALBOTT: A bill (H. R. 32166) granting an increase of pension to Granville T. Shanck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 32167) providing for the sale of certain lands to the city of Trinidad, Colo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 32168) granting a pension to Henry Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 32169) granting an increase of pension to William Maynard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Fred Grach and William Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of business firms of Van Wert, Ohio, against a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Religious Society of Friends, deploring the proposal to fortify the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, petition of State Council of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Ohio, for more stringent laws relative to immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARCLAY: Petition of Local Union No. 59, International Association of Car Workers, of Clearfield, Pa., for repeal of tax on oleomargarine, and favoring investigation of causes of tuberculosis, typhoid fever, and other diseases originating in dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATES: Petition of Judge E. A. Walling and others, of Erie, Pa., favoring House bill 5677, to promote the efficiency of the Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of citizens and business firms of South Dakota, against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John Albrecht Zell and others, of South Dakota, against repeal of duty on barley; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of Retail Merchants' Association of Pittsfield, Me., against a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURLESON: Petition of Nineteenth Century Club, of Oak Park, Ill.; Milk Improvement Association; Columbian Club, of Cherokee, Iowa; San Francisco (Cal.) Club; the Shakespear Club, of Fairbury, Ill.; Lake View Woman's Club, of Chicago; Ladies' Art Club, of Anderson, Ind.; Pierian Club, of Logan, Iowa; Lake Park (Iowa) Woman's Club; Woman's Club, Emmetsburg, Iowa; Pleasant Hour Club, of Paola, Kans.; Revere Woman's Club, of Revere, Mass.; History Club, of Springfield, Mass.; Popular Authors' Literary Club, of Winthrop, Mass.; Muskegon (Mich.) Woman's Club; Saturday Club, of Duluth, Minn.; Current Events Club, of Bismarck, N. Dak.; International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, of Columbus, Ohio; Maple City Lodge, No. 470, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of Painesville, Ohio; Helen Hunt Circle, of Wapakoneta, Ohio; International Molders' Union No. 34, of Scranton, Pa.; Tennessee Federation of Women's Clubs, of Memphis, Tenn.; Waxahachie (Tex.) Department Club; Texas Federation of Women's Clubs; and the Antigo Division, No. 462, Order of Railway Conductors, of Antigo, Wis., favoring investigation of causes of tuberculosis, typhoid fever, and other diseases originating in dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. Barker, of San Marcos, Tex., J. P. Garza, B. J. Solomon, and others, against a rural parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of Woman's Club of Jacksonville, Fla., for repeal of oleomargarine tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of G. A. Dreka and other citizens of Valusia; Ross Graves and other citizens of Osceola; H. W. Davis and other citizens of St. Johns County; George H. Clark and other citizens of Daytona; and R. S. Maley and other citizens of New Smyrna, all of the State of Florida, protesting against the enactment into law by Congress of the parcels-post recommendation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CONRY: Memorial of Board of Aldermen of New York City, for construction of battleship *New York* at the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: Petition of John H. Clark, against parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of E. C. Hubbard and other residents of Elkhorn, Wis., against parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary Tassin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of E. H. Gwinn and 10 other citizens of Victor, Iowa, against rural parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DIEKEMA: Petition of Lewis F. Pearson and others, favoring the Miller-Curtis bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODDS: Petition of citizens of Grand Traverse County, Mich., against bill S. 404, Sunday observance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ESCH: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Herbert M. Nogle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Mary E. Squire, vice president of Association of Army Nurses, for raise of pensions of Civil War nurses to \$30 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of Kings County Republican Club, for construction of battleship *New York* in the Brooklyn Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD of Virginia: Petition of Society for Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, against a criminal reformatory near Mount Vernon; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Covington, Va., and Kalaska, Mich., against a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: Petition of citizens of the third congressional district of Arkansas, against rural parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. FOELKER: Petition of Kings County Republican Club, for construction of battleships in the navy yards of the country; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of Board of Aldermen of New York City, for construction of the battleship *New York* at Brooklyn Navy Yard, and against action thereon by the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Thomas Bros., of Chicago, favoring the Esch phosphorus bill, H. R. 30022; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of G. R. Lyon & Sons, of Waukegan, and H. H. Wagner, of De Kalb, in the State of Illinois, against rural parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of W. T. Robertson, of Rockford, Ill., favoring the Lowden bill, H. R. 30888; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Walla Walla Trades and Labor Council, relative to disposition of the Fort Walla Walla tract of land; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Max H. Kunze, of San Francisco, Cal., in-dorsing San Francisco as site for the Panama Exposition; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. GRONNA: Petition of citizens of Burlington, N. Dak., against parcels-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HANNA: Petition of citizens of North Dakota, protesting against parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of W. Watt and other citizens of North Dakota living along rural routes, favoring additional pay for rural delivery carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of farmers of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota, in convention at Fargo, N. Dak., against removal of duty on barley; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of State Council of Ohio of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, for restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of R. L. Carthey and S. A. Whitsett, against local rural parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John H. Hubbard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Petition of W. S. Henderson and others, wholesale grocers of Utah, for House bill 26540; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCREDIE: Petition of J. Hettrick and others, against a local rural parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Cowlitz Pomona Grange, No. 7, Patrons of Husbandry, for a general parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring bill to promote efficiency of the Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of business men of Auburn and Martel, Nebr., against the establishment of a local rural parcels-post service on the rural delivery routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of executive committee of the Five Years' Meeting in America of Religious Society of Friends, deploring the proposal to fortify the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Petitions of E. R. Clark, Palmer-Potter Hardware Co., Owl Drug Store, T. D. Turner & Co., A. S. Thayer, Frederickson & Kroh Music Co., Calumet Retailers' Association, G. D. Tuter, Oklahoma City Retailers' Association, Charles D. Still, Ellis County Farmers' Institute Executive Committee, L. J. Richards, and others, protesting against a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of business men of Clyde, Wolcott, Williamson, Savannah, Victor, Ontario, Canandaigua, Sodus, Lyons, Newark, and Weedsport, all in the State of New York, for Senate bill 3776, regulating express companies by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REEDER: Petition of citizens of Kansas, against parcels-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SHEFFIELD: Paper to accompany bill for the relief of Daniel D. Mellen and Thomas Congdon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: Petition of W. T. Kissinger and J. K. Drake, of Canton, Ill., for House bill 23641, the Miller-Curtis bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of members of the Old Baptist Church, of Freeport; Christian Church of Minonk; Mount Zion Baptist Church, of Piasa; First Congregational Church, of Bloomington; Methodist Episcopal Church of Freeport; and citizens of Towanda and Millersville, all in the State of Illinois, for the enactment of the Miller-Curtis interstate liquor bill, H. R. 23641; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of John Evanson Co., Le Roy, Ill., against parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STURGISS: Petition of Society of Colonial Dames, against placing a criminal reformatory near Mount Vernon; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: Petition of State Council and George W. Hirst Council, No. 132, of New Weston, Ohio, of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, for more stringent laws relative to immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of daughter of James Fornance; to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE

FRIDAY, January 27, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. KEAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented memorials of the president and officers of the civil government of Porto Rico, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation proposing to interfere with the elective privileges of the people of that island, which were referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

He also presented a petition of the Roughriders of California, praying that San Francisco, Cal., be selected as the site for holding the proposed Panama Canal Exposition, which was referred to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

He also presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of the North Carolina Society of New York, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the establishment and maintenance of permanent forests at the headwaters of navigable streams, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Municipal Council of Tuburan, Province of Cebu, P. I., favoring the enactment of legislation relative to the independence of the people of that island, which were referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of the American Federation of Catholic Societies of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against any appropriation being made for the extension of the work of the National Bureau of Education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of Lawndale Lodge, No. 2034, Modern Brotherhood of America, of Chicago; of Tobey Camp, No. 41, Woodmen of the World, of Decatur; of Harmony Division, No. 417, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Peoria; and of Local Lodge No. 24, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Galesburg, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the admission of publications of fraternal societies to the mail as second-class matter, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. McCUMBER presented a petition of the Current Events Club, of Bismarck, N. Dak., praying that an investigation be made into the condition of dairy products for the prevention and spread of tuberculosis, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BRISTOW presented memorials of sundry citizens of Kansas, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called rural parcels-post bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 783, Modern Brotherhood of America, of Westphalia, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the admission of publications of fraternal societies to the mail as second-class matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Bird City, Kans., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution recognizing the Deity, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BROWN presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 10111) granting an increase of pension to John H. Lennon, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Lincoln, Nebr., praying for the passage of the so-called Weeks forest-reserve bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Blackhill Lodge, No. 198, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Chadron, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the admission of publications of fraternal societies to the mail as second-class matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. DEFEW presented a petition of the Engineers' Club of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the efficiency of the Engineer Corps of the Army, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Kings County Republican Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and a petition of the Board of Aldermen of New York City, N. Y., praying that the battleship *New York* be constructed at the Brooklyn Navy Yard, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented petitions of Local Union No. 499, Knit Goods Cutters, of Cohoes; of Local Union No. 352, Coal Teamsters and Handlers, of Albany; and of Local Union No. 23, Journeymen Horseshoers, of Buffalo, all in the State of New York, praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange No. 1164, Patrons of Husbandry, of Gowanda, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of Empire City Lodge, No. 197, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the admission of publications of fraternal societies to the mail as second-class matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. BURNHAM presented petitions of Darias A. Drake Post, No. 36, of Lakeport; Custer Post, No. 47, of Conway; Post No. 85, of New London; O. W. Lull Post, of Milford; Lincoln Post, No. 28, of Charlestown; Marshal Sanders Post, No. 48, of Littleton; James B. Perry Post, No. 13, of Lebanon; Perkins Post, No. 78, of Hampton; W. I. Brown Post, No. 31, of Penacook; Moses N. Collins Post, No. 26, of Exeter; Ephriam Webster Post, No. 87, of Antrim; Charles Stinson Post, of Goffstown; Eli Wentworth Post, No. 89, of Milton Mills; Penniman Post,